



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2021

No. 106

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANA DEGETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, speak into our lives as You have spoken throughout time. On the day of historic jubilee, speak good news to the poor that they would have occasion to celebrate emancipation from chains that yet bind them.

Proclaim liberty to those still held captive by injustice. Give sight to those blind to Your merciful love. Free all who are oppressed and break every yoke of prejudice and hatred.

Then call upon us to be the bearers of these truths in both word and deed. Cast our eyes on those around us that we would not see slave or free, but brothers and sisters, children of Your creation.

That each person who calls the United States home be allowed to delight in the freedoms afforded them by its democracy.

That liberty and justice would be woven inextricably into the fabric of our Nation and defended on behalf of all her people.

And that henceforward, all may be freed from hate and oppression to enjoy Your perfect design for this Republic.

We pray this, having each been made free in Your name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KELLER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF HOUSTON'S MEXICAN CONSULATE

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of 100 years of the Mexican Consulate's presence in Houston. This is huge for the diplomatic relationship between two neighbors. The consulate was first established in 1920, and today it is the largest diplomatic mission in the city, providing services to tens of thousands of people a year. It is proof of the need to strengthen, now more than ever, our diplomatic ties and tackle our shared opportunities and challenges.

Congratulations, Consul General Alicia Kerber, the first woman to head the consulate's office in Houston. A good neighbor, we have worked together on food drives, COVID testing and vaccines, trade, and immigration rights.

Tomorrow, June 18, the consulate will be opening its new headquarters. Congratulations to the Mexican diplomatic mission in Houston. May we continue to work together the next 100 years.

Congratulations. Felicidades.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BARBARA MORRIS STAFFORD

(Mr. GRIFFITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in great sadness. Last night, at 6:16, my friend, a community leader and a member of my district staff, passed away, Barbara Morris Stafford.

Barbara was born in 1953, and was part of a political family. Her father, Howard Morris, was chairman of the Giles County Board of Supervisors. Her husband was a 10-term member of the Virginia House of Delegates, and when he died young, she took over his seat.

Now a single mother to Chris, Elizabeth, and Mary, she served her community for many years as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates; mayor of her hometown of Pearisburg, Virginia; director of the chamber of commerce; and then, for over 10 years and until last night, as a constituent services representative in my district office.

Barbara was a great leader and she will be sorely missed by the community she loved and the community that loved her.

THANKING CAPITOL POLICE

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2897

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, behind me is a sign that has decorated the office doors of my Republican colleagues for the past few months. I agree with the sentiment and I thank the Capitol Police Officers for their heroic defense on January 6, and every day that they protect the seat of this Nation's government.

My problem is that 175 of my Republican colleagues, many who still have this sign on their doors, voted against an independent bipartisan commission to investigate the causes of the January 6 insurrection.

Capitol Police Officers suffered debilitating physical and mental trauma, and two lost their lives because of the events of that day. Unless we understand how this act of terror was accomplished and hold those who are responsible accountable for their actions, it could happen again.

So why did so many Republicans vote against the commission?

Because they are afraid of what could be found. They are afraid that it could affect their future elections.

This is hypocrisy at its ugliest. While Republicans in Congress pay lip service to the Capitol Police and their heroism, they are too cowardly to back a commission that would shed light on the terrorist attack that put the brave women's and men's lives in danger on that terrible day.

VETERANS DESERVE TIMELY SERVICE

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, America's veterans have served our Nation honorably, and they deserve timely access to the benefits they have earned through their service.

The National Personnel Records Center was forced to scale down its operations due to the COVID-19 pandemic and is currently staffed at 25 percent capacity, well below the staffing level needed to process the estimated 5,000 records requests it receives on an average day. These service records are required for veterans to access medical benefits; adjudicate disability claims; and request a commendation, award, or regalia, such as a Purple Heart or campaign service medal.

To date, there is a backlog of half a million veterans' requests at the NPRC and, in some cases, veterans have waited for over a year for documentation. That is unacceptable.

That is why I introduced the Records Act, which would compel the NPRC to fully reopen, address the backlog, and develop a plan to prevent this from ever happening again.

These men and women were willing to lay down their lives in service to our Nation, and we need to continue working to ensure our veterans get the level of responsiveness from their government that they deserve.

DISCLOSE WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

(Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor an amendment to H.R. 1187, a bill that would increase transparency of publicly traded companies to disclose workplace harassment cases, and I am pleased to see this amendment passed in the House yesterday.

Workplace harassment is far too common, and the shareholders and customers of a company should know whether that company fosters a healthy work culture and that it allows its workers to thrive.

Up to six in seven women in the workplace report having experienced sexual harassment. Seven of 10 people of color report experiencing some form of verbal, racial, or ethnic harassment, and those who speak out usually face retaliation. This amendment would bring to light these forms of mistreatment and incentivize companies to prevent harassment in the workplace.

I thank Ms. FRANKEL for her leadership on H.R. 1187, and I encourage my colleagues to support this workplace improvement bill, as well as improving the quality of life.

HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE MOTHER EMANUEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SHOOTING

(Ms. MACE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MACE. Madam Speaker, June 17, 2015, was one of the darkest days in Charleston, South Carolina, history. Six years ago today, nine church members were gunned down by a white supremacist at Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Today I rise to honor the lives of those lost that day. South Carolina's African-American community showed enormous restraint and an outpouring of love during this time, even to the irredeemable; and today we stand together, wrapped in the pride of Charleston Strong.

So today I would like to recognize Reverend and State Senator Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Tywanza Sanders, Ethel Lance, Susie Jackson, Depayne Middleton Doctor, the Reverend Daniel Simmons, and Myra Thompson.

You will always be remembered, and may you rest in peace.

CONTINUE THE FIGHT FOR RACIAL JUSTICE

(Mr. BOWMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise with great excitement and joy in my heart that today Juneteenth will become a national holiday.

156 years after the end of slavery in this country, we will now, on an annual basis, reflect collectively and, hopefully, begin the process of truth and collective healing as a nation.

But I ask us that we must not stop here. We must continue to go forward to fight for racial justice because in many parts of our country it still exists in the form of housing discrimination and segregation, lack of access to healthcare, and wealth inequality.

It is so humbling to stand here as a Black man in America and take another step toward feeling whole in this country. But we must—we have to come together across party lines to do much more.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FOSTER FRIESS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege today to rise to honor the life of Foster Friess, an American patriot who was a warrior for conservative and Christian values.

Foster truly lived the American Dream. He started his own business that led to incredible success. But Foster leaves behind a legacy that is far greater than success, as his generosity impacted the lives of countless people.

His favorite Bible verse from Galatians: "Carry each other's burdens, and in this way you will fulfill the law of Christ."

To Foster and his wife, Lynnette, that verse was more than words; it was put into action daily. They were passionate about charitable giving and always looking for ways to lend their support to people in need.

He will be missed by many, and my prayers are especially with his wife, Lynnette, their 4 children and 15 grandchildren.

Foster's life glorified God, and his legacy will live on far beyond his years. We must all learn from his example.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID SAUSSY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor former Chatham County Commissioner David Saussy of Savannah, Georgia, who passed away on May 19 at the age of 86.

Born the youngest of five children, David moved to Savannah in 1964, and lived the next 57 years in Ardsley Park.

All who knew David remember his Savannah smile and his proud expressions whenever he talked about Savannah's accomplishments. David's countless friends and family members consider him one of the most generous people they knew.

He was on the boards of the Chat-ham-Savannah Authority for the Homeless and the Coastal Center for Development Services, was a founding member of the St. David's Society of Savannah, and served two terms as a Republican County Commissioner.

I am thankful for the immense impact he had on the Savannah community, and I know his legacy will remain.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

□ 0915

REPEALING THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 473, I call up the bill (H.R. 256) to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 256

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 256.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256. Let me start off by thanking my very good friend and part-

ner, BARBARA LEE, the author of this bill. I am proud to stand with her in her unyielding quest to repeal the 2002 AUMF, and I congratulate her early on for working so hard for over 20 years to get this done.

Nineteen years ago, as a junior Member of Congress, I faced one of the most consequential decisions of my career as an elected official with the United States Congress. The drumbeats of war were reverberating throughout Capitol Hill as the Bush administration prepared to invade Iraq. After carefully considering all the evidence before us, including unanswered questions about post-Saddam Iraq, I cast my vote against authorizing military force against the Hussein regime.

But our vote this morning to repeal the 2002 AUMF is not about relitigating our past. Rather, repealing this outdated authorization is about planning strategically for our future. It is about Congress reclaiming its constitutional obligation to weigh in on matters of war and peace.

On substance, the case for repealing the 2002 AUMF is unassailable. The 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any ongoing military operations in Iraq. The United States is not relying on the 2002 AUMF as the sole authority for any military operations. It has been used as an additional legal justification for strikes by Presidents from both parties but not as the sole authority for any strikes over the last decade. The Biden administration, in an unprecedented move, has announced support for the legislation we are moving today.

Repeal is crucial because the executive branch has a history of stretching the 2002 AUMF's legal authority. It has already been used as justification for military actions against entities that had nothing to do with Saddam Hussein's Ba'athist dictatorship, simply because such entities were operating in Iraq.

Given all of the countries active near Iraq today, including Turkey and Russia, the 2002 AUMF is vulnerable to being abused.

I have heard from my friend, the ranking member, Mr. McCAUL, as well as other Members opposed to this legislation who expressed two concerns: one on the process, about the need for further briefings and conversations, and another on substance, about Iran-backed groups in Iraq.

On procedure, we should dispel ourselves of the fiction that this is a new issue. Congress has been debating what to do in a post-Saddam Iraq for 18 years, and our status of forces agreement expired in 2011. This has been a frontline issue for nearly two decades, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee moved this bill through regular order.

Regarding the concern about Iran-backed groups, let me once again reiterate that the 2002 AUMF was about removing the Hussein regime in Iraq. It had absolutely nothing to do with Iran. A decade and a half before the 2002

AUMF was passed, Iran and Iraq were fighting each other in a vicious war that lasted almost a decade.

If the President needs to strike these groups to defend our Nation, our diplomatic personnel, or our Armed Forces, he can do so under Article II of the Constitution. If any Armed Forces personnel on the ground need to defend themselves, they have the inherent right under unit self-defense principles.

Today, Congress has a historic opportunity to repeal this outdated authorization and reassert its proper authority over the solemn matters of war and peace.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Chairman MEEKS. We work well together. When we disagree, we do it civilly, and I think that is the way this body should operate. But I do disagree on this one.

I have said many times before that war should not be on autopilot. I do think this is an outdated AUMF, and I do believe that Congress needs to reclaim its war powers under Article I of the Constitution.

I also share the desire to repeal the 2002 AUMF, as well as the 2001 AUMF, but that must be part of a serious process to provide clear, updated authorities against the terrorists who still plot to kill Americans at home and abroad. I still hope to work toward that end with my respected friend, Chairman MEEKS, but a repeal and replacement should be simultaneous.

It is confusing to me that we are jamming through a standalone repeal without basic due diligence; without consulting the State Department, the Defense Department, or the intelligence community; without consulting the Government of Iraq and our coalition partners and allies.

In the 3 months since I made that complaint at our markup, the majority still has not scheduled a single briefing. This, in my judgment, is not a serious legislative process for the most serious issues that we face, and that is war and peace.

This feels like yet another political effort to undo one of President Trump's boldest counterterrorism successes: using the 2002 AUMF to remove Qasem Soleimani from the battlefield.

Soleimani was Iran's mastermind of terror for decades. He was responsible for the death of more than 600 Americans and wounded thousands more. He orchestrated the attack on our Baghdad Embassy. He plotted to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador on American soil here in D.C. He oversaw Iran's support for Assad, who killed hundreds of thousands in Syria. In short, America and the world are much safer with Qasem Soleimani gone.

While the 2002 AUMF was largely about Saddam Hussein, it also clearly

addressed the terrorist threats in and emanating from Iraq. All prior administrations, Republican and Democrat, have used it for that purpose.

Today, the biggest threat in Iraq is not Saddam Hussein. We can all recognize that. But it is the Iran-sponsored terrorist groups attacking our diplomats, our soldiers, our embassy, and our citizens. They cannot be targeted using the 2001 AUMF because they are not associated with the forces of al-Qaida, the Taliban, or ISIS, but they can be targeted using the 2002 AUMF, as the prior administration did to take out Soleimani, consistent with longstanding practice.

Last year, the Trump administration “strongly opposed” repeal, saying it would “terminate a critical legal authority” and undermine our defense “against ongoing threats from Iran and Iranian-sponsored proxies.”

The Biden administration now claims that it does not need the 2002 AUMF for current operations because it has Article II authority to use force without congressional authorization.

Is that what we are going to do now, is yield to the President's Article II authority without any congressional authorization?

Madam Speaker, that is precisely what this repeal does. It takes our authority, our Article I authorities, away. We are repealing our Article I authority and yielding it to the President of the United States.

Telling the President to rely solely on Article II, in my judgment, is a big step backward from the war powers reform and reasserting Congress' Article I powers.

It is also inconsistent with the War Powers Resolution. That law says that the President's Article II powers are limited to responding to an attack on the territory or Armed Forces of the United States. It does not cover American civilians in a foreign country, such as our contractors, our diplomats, and our embassy, who are under attack, as I speak, in Iraq.

We should not encourage any President to go it alone without Article I congressional authorization.

Finally, today's vote is not happening in a vacuum. This rushed, standalone repeal, without any consultation with the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the intelligence community, as Mr. MAST has consistently talked about, sends a dangerous message of disengagement that could destabilize Iraq, embolden Iran, which it will, and strengthen al-Qaida and ISIS in the region.

We would avoid such dangers by taking up a repeal and a replacement simultaneously. I think both sides of the aisle agree, we need to update this AUMF, and we need to reform it to the modern-day threats in the region. Saddam Hussein is no longer the threat.

Real AUMF reform requires Congress and the administration to work together. The chairman has committed to doing this, and I appreciate and

trust him. We work well together, but we have to do this, to work together with the administration to replace this aging AUMF with updated authorities needed to keep Americans safe from today's terrorist threats, an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats in the region.

Again, I look forward to working together with Chairman MEEKS and our colleagues on this if we are going to be serious about war powers reform. But this bill is not it. This bill is not responsible. We are not doing this the right way. If we are going to repeal it, let's update the AUMF to modern-day needs and reform it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me first thank our chairman, Mr. MEEKS, for moving this bill through committee. It wasn't an easy lift, and his leadership was extremely important in getting us to where we are today.

I also thank Leader HOYER, Speaker PELOSI, and let me take a minute to thank our staff: My chief of staff, Julie Nickson, who is here with us today; my legislative director, Gregory Adams; Congressman MEEKS' staff; and all of the staff members who have worked for 20 years to get us to this point.

I also want to thank our Democratic and Republican cosponsors and our outside broad spectrum of groups, like the Friends Committee on National Legislation, Win Without War, the American Legion, and Americans for Prosperity that have fought alongside us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy and letters of support from many of these groups.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 256—REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—REP. LEE, D-CA WITH 134 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 256, to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (“2002 AUMF”). This bipartisan legislation would terminate the October 16, 2002, statutory authorization for the use of military force against Iraq.

The Administration supports the repeal of the 2002 AUMF, as the United States has no ongoing military activities that rely solely on the 2002 AUMF as a domestic legal basis, and repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations. Furthermore, the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

In working with the Congress on repealing and replacing other existing authorizations of military force, the Administration seeks to ensure that the Congress has a clear and

thorough understanding of the effect of any such action and of the threats facing U.S. forces, personnel, and interests around the world. As the Administration works with the Congress to reform AUMFs, it will be critical to maintain the clear authority to address threats to the United States' national interests with appropriately decisive and effective military action.

[Press Release—June 14, 2021]

CVA URGES PASSAGE OF 2002 AUMF REPEAL
GRASSROOTS VETERANS GROUP APPLAUDS REP. LEE, BIPARTISAN LEADERSHIP ON CRITICAL MEASURE TO RESTORE BALANCE OF POWER

ARLINGTON, VA.—Concerned Veterans for America (CVA) Executive Director Nate Anderson released the following statement urging the U.S. House to pass H.R. 256, Rep. Barbara Lee's bill to repeal the 2002 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF):

“Debating, authorizing, and exercising oversight of American military action is one of Congress's most solemn duties. Unfortunately, Congress has largely deferred to the executive branch and neglected its role in matters of war and peace over the last twenty years. Repealing the 2002 AUMF would be an important step toward Congress reasserting its constitutional role in shaping foreign policy and giving the American people a voice. We applaud Rep. Lee for her continued leadership on this issue along with the broad coalition of bipartisan representatives and organizations who have found common ground in this endeavor.”

BACKGROUND

Americans for Prosperity, a partner of CVA, issued a Key Vote Alert for this measure, signaling it will take into account lawmakers' votes in its annual legislative scorecard.

CVA recently led a coalition in sending a letter to members of Congress urging support of a bipartisan resolution introduced by Sens. Kaine and Young to repeal a pair of obsolete AUMFs. The group was joined on the letter by Defense Priorities Initiative, Freedom Works, and the R Street Institute.

CVA has been working to repeal the outdated 2001 and 2002 AUMFs for years, making it a priority for its grassroots and advocacy efforts in its annual policy agendas (2019, 2020, 2021). Notably, though less than a fifth of current members of Congress voted on the 2001 AUMF, it has been invoked to justify 41 operations in 19 countries since passage.

In 2019, the group partnered with VoteVets, a traditional rival, to urge lawmakers to reclaim their constitutional war powers duties. The New York Times wrote about the unlikely partnership. Setting the example for lawmakers and the administration, the groups found common ground on this issue and flew activists and volunteers in to DC to meet with their members of Congress to bring lasting policy change in Washington.

CVA has been staunch in its support of lawmakers who have taken a principled stand and worked to repeal these measures in the past. In 2019, CVA welcomed the addition of the bipartisan War Powers Caucus to Congress, applauding lawmakers for prioritizing the issue. CVA also launched a digital ad campaign thanking lawmakers for standing against endless war, praising lawmakers for voting to ensure proper Congressional input before any offensive military force against Iran.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, As organizations from across the ideological spectrum, we are committed to addressing one of our country's most critical national security needs: ending our forever wars. We don't always agree on the reasons to do so, but we do

agree that nearly two decades of endless war has failed to make us safer and a new approach is necessary. To achieve this goal and reorient U.S. foreign policy away from the unaccountable, interventionist approach we've seen for nearly two decades, Congress must sunset the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Since its enactment on September 14, 2001, the 2001 AUMF has served as a blank check for endless, global war under multiple presidents. Despite congressional intent to only give then-President George W. Bush the authority to use military force against those responsible for the 9/11 attacks and those who harbored them, the law failed to include any time limits, geographic constraints, specific objectives or an exit strategy. As a result, three successive presidents have used the law to unilaterally expand the nation's use of military force against individuals, groups, and even nation states never intended by Congress. Presidents Bush, Obama, and Trump have used the 2001 AUMF to justify U.S. military action in 19 countries at least 41 times. The expansive U.S. militarized counterterrorism footprint now extends to at least 80 countries, costing an estimated \$6.4 trillion, as well as the lives of thousands of American soldiers, and hundreds of thousands of civilians abroad.

Congress passed the 2002 Iraq AUMF to authorize force against the Saddam Hussein regime. It is not required for any ongoing military activities, as the executive branch relies on an overly broad interpretation of the 2001 AUMF for operations against ISIS, al Qaeda, and other groups. However, both the Obama and Trump administrations expanded their interpretation of the scope of the 2002 Iraq AUMF beyond congressional intent. Most recently, the Trump administration cited it as a legal basis for the targeted killing of Iranian general Qassem Soleimani, an action clearly unrelated to the original scope of the authorization. Retaining this law renders it susceptible to further abuse.

President Biden has stated a desire to end the forever wars. With this in mind, Congress should sunset the 2001 AUMF eight months after a law is enacted and immediately repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Rather than expediting a new AUMF, Congress must first publicly debate whether military force is both necessary and appropriate for addressing current security challenges and what, if any, new legal authority may be necessary. In the interim, Article II of the Constitution provides the president with the legal authority needed to defend our country against an actual or truly imminent armed attack.

With a new president who has signalled support for our government's institutional checks and balances and a U.S. public that supports an end to endless war, it is time for Congress seize the opportunity to reassert its constitutional authority over war powers. In fact, the U.S. Constitution places the power to declare war squarely in the hands of Congress for good reason. Our democracy relies on the foundational belief that it is the people to whom the U.S. government remains accountable, not the president. By assigning Congress the sole authority to declare war, our nation's founders sought to ensure that a decision as momentous as the one to wage war was properly debated, scrutinized, and justified. Failing to sunset the 2001 AUMF and repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF now will continue to effectively cede Congress' power over war and peace to the executive branch.

In the past five years, the House of Representatives or its committees have voted to repeal both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF, drawing both Democratic and Republican support. With a new administration

who agrees that these authorizations are outdated, now is the time to finish the work Congress started. We urge you to join Rep. Barbara Lee's effort in turning the page on this unsuccessful chapter of U.S. foreign policy by sunseting the 2001 AUMF and repealing the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union, Brennan Center for Justice, Bridges Faith Initiative, BringOurTroopsHome.US, Center for International Policy, Concerned Veterans for America, Council for a Livable World, Demand Progress, Defense Priorities Initiative, FreedomWorks, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Human Rights First, National Religious Campaign Against Torture, Pax Christi USA, Peace Action, Project On Government Oversight, Protect Democracy, Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, R Street Institute, Secure Families Initiative, September 11th Families for Peaceful Tomorrows, The Center for Victims of Torture, VoteVets, Win Without War, Women's Action for New Directions.

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY,

June 15, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES, On behalf of Americans for Prosperity's activists in all 50 states, I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187, the so-called "Corporate Governance Improvement and Investor Protection Act."

Businesses can be a force for good when they serve customers, drive life-improving innovations, and enable employees to find fulfillment in their work. But the best way to do that is through bottom-up approaches, not top-down regulation. Mobilizing the Securities and Exchange Commission to force industry from all corners of the economy to adhere to dubious, ambiguous, and one-size-fits all requirements—as this bill does—will only harm our ability to improve society and undermine America's capacity to lead in the global economy.

H.R. 1187 represents a sweeping expansion of government overreach and dramatic mission creep for the SEC, which has neither the authority, expertise, nor accountability to evaluate the materiality of these disclosures to shareholders and potential shareholders. Further, the standards these regulations set, and the effectiveness of the methods to which those standards would be met, are unclear. As an example, recent evidence has shown there is virtually no relationship between trends in energy-related carbon emissions and top-down climate policies such as the implementation of international agreements, carbon pricing, cap-and-trade, or command and control sectoral regulation. In fact, since the 2007 Massachusetts v. EPA decision, countries as well as states that have not endorsed these policies have generally reduced per capita energy-related carbon dioxide emissions at a far greater pace than those that have.

Beyond this, the very act of forcing companies to meet preset, one-size-fits-all requirements ultimately undermines the leaps in innovation we need to actually achieve our shared goals for the environment and society as a whole. Business leaders and consumers—not politicians and appointed Washington officials—are the driving force to innovate and deliver superior products and services that solve for the needs of today while also pushing our country toward a better future that benefits all.

This bill would also impose new costly burdens on companies, open the floodgates to cronyism, undermine businesses' ability to create new value, and ultimately put a drag on our recovering economy.

We look forward to working together to improve the environment and address other great challenges facing our country. The best way to do that is through bottom-up innovation, not top-down regulation such as those mandated by this bill.

I urge you to vote "NO" on H.R. 1187. This vote will be recorded in our legislative scorecard for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

BRENT GARDNER,
Chief Government Affairs Officer,
Americans for Prosperity.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL COMMANDER,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2021.

Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEE: On behalf of the nearly two million members of The American Legion, I am pleased to express support for H.R. 256, which would repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002. Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to authorize force against Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime in order to defend the United States against the threat posed by the regime's alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction. This threat proved unfounded and the mission undertaken pursuant to the 2002 Iraq AUMF—designated "Operation Iraqi Freedom"—officially ended on December 11, 2011.

Our servicemembers have accomplished their original objectives in Iraq, a dangerous regime was removed, and the authorization for the war should end. With the understanding that complex global threats cannot be solved by military power alone, we value the importance of sustaining a civilian-led approach of elevating diplomacy and development alongside a strong defense. The American Legion stands ready to assist members of Congress with strengthening our nation's interests and ensuring that diplomacy is the first instrument of national power considered at the highest level.

In accordance with American Legion Resolution No. 22: Addressing the 'Forever War', passed unanimously by our National Executive Committee in meetings held October 14–15, 2020, which urges a renewal of a proper constitutional balance to American foreign policy decision-making by encouraging Congress to repeal and replace outdated Authorizations for Use of Military Force, we strongly support this bill.

We applaud your leadership in addressing this critical issue facing our nation's servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

For God & Country,

JAMES W. "BILL" OXFORD,
National Commander.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just take a minute to honor my dear friend, the late Congressman Walter Jones, a Republican from North Carolina who was my partner for many years to build bipartisan support to bring our troops home.

I am proud to stand with everyone as we exercise our most important duty assigned by the Constitution to decide when and how America goes to war.

We cannot revise history as it relates to why this authorization was put into place.

Eighteen years ago, in front of the infamous "Mission Accomplished" banner backdrop, former President Bush told the Nation that the major combat operations in Iraq have ended.

In 2011, President Obama brought our combat troops home, and yet this authority remains on the books, vulnerable to misuse because Congress has not acted to remove it.

The Bush administration, yes, misled the American people by saying there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, that Iraq posed an imminent threat by drawing a false connection between the tragic events of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein. Those lies and misinformation had deadly consequences. The mistakes continue to haunt us today.

Once the war started, the Out of Iraq Caucus was founded by Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, me, and led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. Over 80 Members joined. Many of us took our protests to the streets, joining hundreds of thousands protesting the unnecessary, immoral war of choice. Year after year, we worked for the safe and orderly withdrawal of our troops.

I share all this history, not because of nostalgia, but we have to remember why this authorization was passed, because 87 percent of current Members of the House were not here to vote on this AUMF in 2002. The Constitution requires that we cannot appropriate funds for armies for more than 2 years, and yet for almost two decades we have failed to revisit these AUMFs.

To this day, our endless wars continue, costing trillions of dollars and thousands of lives in a war that goes way beyond any scope that Congress conceived or intended.

I want to salute our veterans, our young men and women in uniform. They did everything we have asked them to do. Many veterans support this repeal.

The outdated 2002 AUMF bears no correlation to the threats we face today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, the President earlier stated his support for the bill, saying that the 2002 AUMF will not impact current military operations, but repeal can prevent our country from entering another protracted engagement under this outdated authority.

We can't afford to leave this in place indefinitely. For two decades it has been in place. This is our opportunity to restore our constitutional role.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to comment that to me it is very interesting, the timing of the gentlewoman from California's repeal. It happened after President Trump had an air strike to take out Soleimani in Iraq, at exactly the same time. He had authority to do so under the 2002 AUMF and Article II under the Constitution.

What is interesting about now, the other side of the aisle was upset when

President Biden struck the Shia proxies in Syria, and that is when we saw this bill resurrect itself again in this Congress. Very interesting timing.

What I object to is that now we are abdicating our responsibility by giving the President Article II authorities alone without any authorization of use of military force from the Congress. They talk a lot about Article I on the other side, but aren't we abdicating our Article I responsibility?

I am all for updating this thing, but to completely do away with it and just give this President Article II authorities to do whatever he wants without any congressional review, in my judgment, is a wrong step forward.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I will just say really quickly: Before Soleimani, we had passed a bill on the AUMF in 2019, so it wasn't in response to President Trump. So this was attempted even before that.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), head of the United States delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and a member of our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11. Members of the Bush administration seized on our fear at that time to persuade Americans that Saddam Hussein posed a grave threat to the United States, and Congress passed an Authorization for Use of Military Force without any limitation on how long it could be in effect.

Nineteen years later, and ten years after we formally ended ground operations, it is still law. This is an abrogation of Article I responsibilities and duties of the Congress of the United States.

There is no more profound power vested in us in the Constitution than to send our young men and women into combat. It is long past time that we dealt with this AUMF and righted the imbalance between the powers of Article I, which are exclusively those of Congress, and the powers of Article II for a Commander in Chief only after Congress has acted.

I am proud to support this measure today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a member of our HFAC committee with strong foreign affairs credentials.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, on October 16, 2002, the United States Congress voted to authorize military action against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The text of the authorization was clear. That was its purpose. Years later, Saddam Hussein is long dead, and our military action has ended.

The 2002 AUMF is separate and distinct from the 2001 AUMF, which au-

thorized our counterterrorism efforts after 9/11 and which remains in use today.

The 2002 AUMF is not in use. It is long overdue for repeal, which is why we have voted multiple times to repeal the 2002 AUMF with bipartisan support.

Since coming to Congress, I have been very clear, Congress must reassert congressional authority in decisions of war and peace. The authority is required by our Constitution, and it is fundamental to our representation of our constituents, especially our servicemembers.

Our men and women in uniform deserve to see a new era of congressional accountability, one where Members of Congress do not shirk their accountability when it comes to issues of war and peace.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), the vice chair of the subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this critical legislation to repeal the 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force.

I want to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and the chair of this committee for their enduring leadership on this issue.

I was in middle school when Congress passed this authorization to use force against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. Today, as a Member of this body, I am voting to repeal it.

I make this point to remind my colleagues that the decisions around war and peace are some of the most consequential ones we make here. My generation has spent our entire adult lives in the shadow of two long and protracted wars.

I am proud to represent San Diego, a military community that has made incredible sacrifices because of that vote in 2002. Now it is time to take it off the books.

Repealing this authorization would not impact any of our current military operations, but repealing it will prevent a future President from abusing it and reclaim Congress' rightful role in authorizing war, ensuring our servicemembers know that they are not being sent to harm's way without a full debate of this representative body. There is nothing rushed about something that has taken 20 years.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this repeal.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just clarify again. This bill was filed last Congress after President Trump took out the mastermind of terror for two decades in the Middle East, Qasem Soleimani, to challenge his authority to take out one of the biggest

threats to the region and to our American soldiers, 600 of whom were killed and thousands wounded.

That is the genesis for this legislation, and I think that is important to note. If we do away with this without replacing it, we abdicate our Article I authorities in an absolute manner to the executive branch under Article II.

I think that it is important for anyone watching this debate to understand what we are doing here today.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER. Madam Speaker, I remember over the period of the last Presidency joining my colleagues on both sides of the aisle at various times when statements were made that we are just going to leave Iraq or we are going to leave the Kurds in Syria, and I think that was shortsighted, those statements, so I joined my colleagues on both sides.

But, yet, today, we are debating the repeal of the 2002 AUMF as if we all somehow believe that we are going to magically repeal this and then come up with some narrow replacement that is going to authorize, when we can't really agree that the sky is blue in this group.

But I want to, for a second, look back and say what would have happened when this was introduced originally. So in January of 2014 this repeal was introduced. Let's say we passed it.

What happened since January of 2014? Well, I will tell you. In June of 2014 we began airstrikes against ISIS. Because of the 2002 AUMF, we were able to assist our allies to defeat ISIS in their capital of Raqqa, their stronghold in Mosul, and we even destroyed their caliphate throughout the region.

I know my colleagues who support this legislation have the right intentions in mind, but even President Biden's own Statement of Administration Policy admits that this repeal would have an impact on our military operations. That is why we don't call for a blanket repeal, but a narrowly crafted replacement. Let's do that first.

The bleak reality is that without an authorization to fight terror, more innocent human beings will suffer. Let us not forget the horrors that ISIS perpetrated on innocent men, women, and children. Men were beheaded for practicing their faith, women were stoned to death for trying to flee abusive relationships. Children were made foot soldiers and suicide bombers. Without this AUMF, this would still be happening.

Today, we have militia groups attacking the American Embassy in Baghdad. We have malign forces trying to destabilize the democratically elected Iraqi Government. We have dozens of terror organizations, including ISIS, that want to revive the caliphate which brought so much pain and suffering to so many in the region.

Before we hastily pass this ill-thought-out and ill-timed political leg-

islation, I urge every Member to meet with Intel, to meet with the Department of Defense to hear about the realities of the threats we face in this world, and maybe once that happens and we put aside these partisan stripes for a moment, we can have an honest debate about what a replacement would look like. Short-term political gain has no impact on what foreign actors make in terms of their policy decisions. ISIS and terrorists don't change based on what we debate here, and they certainly didn't give up yet.

We made a decision; the President made a decision to leave Afghanistan. While I disagree with that, I certainly hope he is successful and that my predictions are wrong, but I do know that that sent a message. It sent a message that America is disengaging in the war on terror. What would this send as well, right on the heels of this?

What message would this send to the terrorists who are on the ropes, who haven't attacked in the United States, not because they don't want to, but because we haven't let them because we have fought them on their territory, before they have the ability to organize and attack us here?

What does that message send? Because to a terrorist, all they need is the ability to go out and say, "We are winning," to recruit somebody, to give their life for that terrorist cause.

Madam Speaker, I understand where this is coming from. I deeply would love an AUMF that replaces this the right way, but this is the wrong process and the wrong order to do that. So I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this.

□ 0945

Mr. MEEKS. I want to remind the gentleman that the 2014 strike against ISIS, the primary AUMF, where it was utilized in the 2001 AUMF, continues and still is in existence. Also, when you talk about Soleimani, the primary utilization, still-President Trump talked about Article II. So those still are in existence to protect the American people and at the President's options.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the assistant Speaker.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 19 years ago, this body passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force based on lies and misinformation about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

This authorization has entangled us in a decades-long war, costing billions of dollars and tens of thousands of lives.

Millions of young people in this country, including my three children, have never known an America that wasn't at war.

This repeal is long overdue and absolutely vital to protecting the integrity of our system of checks and balances and the security of our Nation and servicemembers.

Today we stand up for Congress' constitutional war powers and the right to

say "no" to conflicts abroad and "yes" to peace.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), a combat veteran, a distinguished servicemember, and a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, war powers and AUMF, it is a distant impersonal term to talk about the work of the warfighter. And I think for people on both sides of the aisle, it is anything but impersonal.

Probably all of us in here know people who have passed in our wars, roads named after them, schools named after them, VFWs, and other buildings named after them. It is not impersonal to those of us in here and to those who have been targeted by snipers, have had ordnance dropped on them, walked across fields of improvised explosive devices, were burned alive in Humvees and other pieces of equipment that they served their time in.

It is not impersonal to us. We all know the stories. And I like to believe that we do take that very seriously.

And there is broad-based consensus on the fact that these AUMFs need to be changed. But to do that and to have the appropriate responsibility to those who go out there and fight the wars, we have to talk to the people who go out there and command the battles, that sit in the JOC and sit in the TOC, and sit in the Pentagon.

But, instead, what we did was we had professors from NYU and Harvard and Yale come in and speak to us for a few minutes about their opinions.

But what I can tell you is that a battlefield looks nothing like a lecture hall or a faculty lounge. They are not the same things. And their opinions are not nearly as weighty as those of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Navy or the Commandant of the Marine Corps or one of our combatant commanders.

If we take seriously this power that the 435 of us in this body have, not just to cast a vote, but to cast an informed vote to say that we went out there and did every bit of diligence that we could, it means speaking to those individuals, asking those questions, and then coming to the conclusions that bring us to the votes that we cast.

But without that, we are acting on pure arrogance that we know better without asking any questions, that we know what to do without going out there and seeking any facts, without finding out how this will affect the defense of our homeland. And it is not what gives the honor and respect to those who go out there and defend this country. It is not what gives the honor and respect to them that they deserve.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service, and I really respect him for what he

put on the line for our country. We will always do that.

But I will also say that those individuals who we did bring before the committee, though they might be professors now, they either served in the DOD or the White House, plus we had a classified briefing in the auditorium with representatives from the Joint Chiefs. So we were making sure that we had to get all of the information that we could in regards to this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health and Global Human Rights and the Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished author of this legislation, Congresswoman LEE, for bringing forth this legislation.

Madam Speaker, for the past 20 years, the 2002 Authorization has been used to wage war and cause destruction around the world.

While many in this Congress have participated in war, I am someone who has endured war and understands the impact it has on innocent lives. The act of war does nothing to make us safer.

Engaging in endless wars has led us to undermining our most important morals: peace, liberty, and justice.

Congress cannot sit idly by as we take more civilian lives and decrease our ability to build prosperity at home.

The more we spend on endless wars, the less we are able to invest in our own people with education, housing, and employment opportunities.

I am pleased that Congress is finally working on restoring its authority over matters of peace and war.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his comments about us seeking advice on Authorization for Use of Military Force from academics from Harvard, Yale, and NYU. And though they may have spent time serving in defense roles, I would remind the chairman that in the hearings that these academics voiced their opinions in, they expressed numerous times that they didn't even have the access to information that we had. They said it over and over. They didn't have the answers that we might have the answers to.

I would say it is incumbent upon this body to seek answers not from those who say we have more information, but to ask somebody who may potentially have more information than us so that we can make a more informed decision about policy that we are tasked with voting on that affects so many.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the chair of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256.

Let me first recognize the tireless efforts of Representative BARBARA LEE, who has spearheaded this issue for nearly two decades and has been the moral conscience in Congress against endless, unjust wars.

The decision to go to war is one of the most profound and consequential a nation can make. This 2002 AUMF is outdated, and its repeal will end its legal authority to justify U.S. intervention in Iraq.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war. By repealing this authorization today, we are working to return this power back to the people's House and the Senate. That is how a checks and balances system works.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 256.

Though a combat-tested security partner, Iraq continues to be a fragile state. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force allowed the United States to end Saddam Hussein's reign of terror. It also allowed us to return and assist the people of Iraq when decisions made by the Obama-Biden administration led to the formation of ISIS and enabled the terror group to establish a caliphate in northwestern Iraq in 2014.

Now, that same Authorization for Use of Military Force provides the United States with the legal authority for military operations in support of our Iraqi partners, if needed, and against terrorist threats in Iraq, including those from the Iran-backed militia groups.

This critical piece of legislation provided the authority for last year's strike on Iran's terror mastermind Soleimani, whose IEDs, I might remind people, killed more than 600 American soldiers and wounded thousands more.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force also provides authority to strike Iranian-backed Shia militia groups that have and are currently attacking Americans in Iraq.

This shortsighted and purely political effort to repeal the authority without a replacement sends the wrong message and will embolden the Islamic terror groups and the world's largest state sponsor of terror, Iran.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill until we have a viable replacement that addresses the threat of Iran and its proxies.

We have already turned our backs on Afghanistan. We should not repeat this error in Iraq.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our illustrious leader and Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important and overdue legislation to the floor.

Congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, for being the chair of the committee and, as your ranking member has said, striving to act in a very bipartisan way. That doesn't hold for today necessarily; but, nonetheless, where there is a will, there is a way.

Madam Speaker, nearly 20 years have passed since the Congress passed the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and 10 years have passed since the formal end of U.S. military operations: Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Yet, today, 10 years later, our Nation is still operating under an outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, which risks being used, and in some cases has been used, as a blank check to conduct unrelated military operations.

Let me be clear. Repealing the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force in no way precludes us, our country, from defending our military and diplomatic personnel in Iraq. Article II of the Constitution, the 2001 AUMF, and the bilateral agreements with Iraq permit this.

But it will prevent a situation in which U.S. military personnel are deployed or military operations are conducted, without the approval of Congress or the country, for purposes that are unconnected to the AUMF's original purpose.

We are here because of the courage of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. No one has been fiercer or more relentless or more principled on this issue. I thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and others who have worked with her over the years.

I thank also our Foreign Affairs chair, GREGORY MEEKS, who has moved this bipartisan priority with both urgency and unity through the committee.

□ 1000

We are pleased that this legislation, which has previously passed the House twice, has over 130 cosponsors. Thank you, also, to Senator TIM KAINE, a longtime leader on AUMF repeal and reform in the Senate, who has introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF will defend Congress' constitutional authorities and our American democracy's system of separation of powers.

Under the Constitution, it is the Congress that has the sole duty to declare war. We must reassert that authority to decide if and when our country goes to war.

This repeal is also possible because of the leadership of President Joe Biden, who understands and has respect for Congress' constitutional authorities. He understands the need for this action to keep our troops and the American people safe. Again, that is our first responsibility: to protect and defend.

The Congress stands in agreement with the Biden-Harris administration, which has stated that “the President is committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a narrow and specific framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.”

Why has that been elusive, for us to come up with a better, more focused plan?

Madam Speaker, just for public information, when we have tried to come up with a newer, fresher, more appropriate AUMF, we have three challenges.

What is the scope? What is the Authorization for Use of Military Force for? Is it for boots on the ground? Is it for air? What is it for? What is the scope that we are giving the authority to the executive branch to use?

What is the geography? How far does that extend? Is this global? Is it specific to a region?

These are important decisions because some of the threats are, shall we say, unpredictable. But that doesn't mean what we do here should be unpredictable.

The third is the timing. How long does it last? What is it for? How far in geography does it extend? And how long does that authority last?

Over time, as we have tried to replace this outdated Authorization for Use of Military Force, we have run into those disagreements internally as well as with the White House. But the more the public knows about our commitment to honoring our constitutional responsibility—and we will work with a President who is not here to undermine that—hopefully, we will have that authorization, as necessary, as we go forward.

As Members of Congress, the first duty we have is to keep the American people safe. That includes our courageous men and women in uniform, who sacrifice every day for our freedoms.

To do this, we must pursue a National Security Strategy and a defense policy that are smart, strong, and strategic. And we look forward to working with the administration on this vital mission.

With that, I again salute our distinguished colleague from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her persistence and her leadership; our distinguished chairman, Mr. GREGORY MEEKS.

Again, I am grateful for the courteous consideration of this legislation today, although we may not be in complete agreement.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong vote for H.R. 256, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force, and hope that we will have a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WATERS), the chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Chairman GREGORY MEEKS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's resolution to repeal the outdated 2002 AUMF, which was used to start the Iraq war, which killed more than 4,500 American soldiers and approximately 200,000 Iraqi civilians.

As the chair of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I worked with Congresswoman LEE and our former colleague, Lynn Woolsey, to end the Iraq war and bring our troops home.

The Iraq war finally ended in December 2011. We cannot allow this outdated AUMF to be used as a blank check for future wars. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in authorizing and providing oversight over United States military action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

The United States Congress has the sole constitutional power to declare war and, therefore, a constitutional duty to consider, debate, and, if necessary, repeal an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The very title of this AUMF shows how much it has strayed from its original purpose. The 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq was designed to address the threat posed by an Iraq run by Saddam Hussein. He has been dead for many years.

We have the responsibility to members of the Armed Forces who risk their lives, and the American public who fund these seemingly endless conflicts, to terminate the current 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force. Since 2009, I voted consistently to revoke this open-ended authorization and to reassert Congress' role.

For too long, we have failed this responsibility. Congress must act now to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), a distinguished Member.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we, who are honored to be Members of Congress, are here to pass judgment on the great issues of our time. There is no greater issue of our time than the issue of war and peace. It is about life and death.

We should not be allowed to escape our duty, responsibility, and obligation to vote on issues of war and peace.

We must repeal this authorization so that Congress can take up its responsibility and vote on the great issues of our time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for recognizing me and yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to repeal the AUMF resolution of 2002. Here we are, in 2021.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against that AUMF, and to this day, I believe it produced one of the worst foreign policy disasters in U.S. history. It was built on a lie; it claimed the lives of over 4,400 Americans and countless Iraqi civilians; and it cost our Treasury trillions of dollars.

The Iraq war ended 10 years ago, but this AUMF is still on the books. It is a blank check, and we need to get rid of it. We run the risk that administrations will misuse it to justify future military action and directly undermine Congress' Article I war powers authority.

The House has voted three times to repeal this AUMF, and today, it is time to pass it. Let us have a victory here on the floor—and celebrate another victory that the Supreme Court has upheld the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to recognize a gentleman who I want to thank for his service, for he is a Marine combat veteran who served in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 256 to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force that sent me and thousands of other young Americans into war in Iraq.

Even though the mission in Iraq has been over for almost a decade, this authorization remains on the books. This is not a mistake or an oversight. It is a dangerous abdication of Congress' responsibility.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the more opportunity it has to be abused as a blank check for military action in the Middle East without the input of the American people.

The longer this AUMF is on the books, the longer we in Congress are bending our own moral and constitutional duty to debate and to decide when to send American soldiers into harm's way and to look into the eyes of servicemen and -women when we do. We cannot run from this incredible responsibility any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill and re-taking Congress' constitutional role in exercising our war powers.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), my friend.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was a sophomore in high school when Congress gave the green light for war in Iraq. Nearly 20 years later, I am here as a freshman Member of Congress, urging my colleagues to repeal that authorization.

For over half my life, Republican and Democratic Presidential administrations have used the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force as a blank check for war and the justification for aggressive military actions in the Middle East.

Young people today have never known a time when our country was not fighting overseas or conducting strikes on poor and Brown nations. It is time for that to stop.

The American people are tired of endless wars. We need a more peaceful and productive foreign policy grounded in diplomacy and human rights, and we, finally, have an administration that agrees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution, Congresswoman LEE's longtime effort to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

The Constitution is clear: Only Congress has the power to authorize war.

In 2002, this resolution was adopted in order to address the ongoing threat from Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq, the threat that it represented to America. Saddam Hussein is gone. A new government has been established in Iraq, and this AUMF is obsolete.

There are threats to the United States, and we have the authority to address those threats when they arise. There are ongoing threats that we ought to be able to debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives and act upon when our security is threatened. But no President of any party should ever be able to reach back two decades when Congress, on a different fact situation, authorized the use of force in order to authorize any use of force that they deemed to be important to them.

Congress has this authority, and we need to assert it. That is what we do today.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment, once again, that repealing this Author-

ization for Use of Military Force, which has been used in the past to take out Soleimani and other very bad actors, and not replacing it does not uphold our Article I responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, what we are doing is ceding our authority under the Constitution to the executive branch and saying: Oh, Article II, the President has unlimited discretion under Article II to do whatever the hell he wants to do.

That is not what this Congress should be doing. We need to replace this with an updated AUMF that reflects the threats in the region, the current threats, which are Iran and the proxies of Iran that have hit our embassy, have killed our soldiers, and are attacking our diplomats in the region.

□ 1015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Texas that maybe we should do—if you think Iran is a threat—an AUMF for Iran. This AUMF was for Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to repeal an almost two decades-long Authorization for Use of Military Force against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying thank you, thank you, thank you to my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I was an activist back in 2001, leading the largest immigrant advocacy organization and the largest march at the time against the war in Iraq, because we knew that what was happening was wrong. And we were looking at Congress, and saying, Congress needs to make sure they are taking action, and BARBARA LEE stood up at that time on her own.

The 2002 AUMF was based on a lie; a lie that has resulted in hundreds of thousands of lives lost, including civilians, U.S. servicemembers, journalists, humanitarian workers; a lie that was used as the legal basis for military hostilities beyond Iraq, hostilities that were never authorized by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this must be the beginning and not the end of our work to end endless wars. We must continue our work to forge a meaningful engagement with the rest of the world toward a lasting peace. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the chairman for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just a point of clarification to the chairman. I am not talking about a declaration of war against Iran. What we are talking about is what is the current threat in Iraq. Today, it is proxies, the Shia proxies of Iran in Iraq.

The reason why President Biden hit them in Syria, it is the authorities that President Trump used to take out Soleimani in Iraq, not in Iran. Soleimani, "The Butcher", the master-

mind of terror for two decades, killing 600 American soldiers and wounding thousands more.

I am all for updating this thing, but to replace this and throw it out with not anything to protect our men and women who are in Iraq today, including the diplomats, is highly irresponsible, it is reckless, and it is dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote, once again, to repeal the 2002 Authorization for Use of Military Force because we cannot continue endless wars.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF authorization for war again Saddam Hussein's regime. I voted against that resolution. And, now, here we are nearly 20 years later, and we have seen three successive administrations use the AUMF to wage war in ways that were never intended, that were way beyond the scope of the congressional authorization that was used.

Only Congress has the authority to declare war. And it is time for us to reclaim that authority. We can't let another day go by with this authorization in place. We cannot support endless wars.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the lead Republican on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that this argument that we have to get rid of the AUMF is just ridiculous. We pass the National Defense Authorization Act every year. We have passed it every year for 60 consecutive years. If we don't want to authorize something we are doing militarily, we can stop it at any time. So this is a false argument that we have to do this to be able to prevent what we are doing in Afghanistan or Iraq or anyplace else.

But with regard to this specific bill, this is a bad deal for our national security and the safety of American servicemembers overseas. Since the liberation of Iraq, the murderous Iranian regime has armed proxy organizations to kill Americans and innocent Iraqis.

Iran has armed proxy militias with small arms, mortars, rockets, and now sophisticated UAVs that can avoid base defenses. The Obama and Trump administrations both used the 2002 AUMF to target terrorist threats originating from Iraq.

Threats like ISIS and militias backed by Iran have killed and injured American servicemembers and contractors. This bill would repeal the 2002 AUMF and offer nothing in its place; no authorization to mop up ISIS forces or whatever movement comes next; no authorization to target Iranian proxies whose sole goal is to destabilize Iraq and kill Americans.

This bill only offers the illusion of withdrawal. Like President Biden's

failing Afghanistan strategy, it does nothing to change the reality on the ground in Iraq. The threats we face today will remain, and American commanders will be forced to face those threats with one fewer tool than they had the day before.

Repealing the 2002 AUMF without a replacement only undermines our national security. It offers no real solution to the issues.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my friend that this 2002 AUMF has not been utilized as the sole reason or the sole authority in over 10 years. The 2001 AUMF is still in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), who is a colonel, retired, and we thank him for his service in our military.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on repealing the 2002 AUMF. That was the authorization that sent me and hundreds of thousands of servicemen and -women to Iraq since the invasion in 2003. The justification for that war was fundamentally flawed.

But to be certain, the purpose of the 2002 AUMF established a broad military mission in Iraq. Yet, I have no doubt that that mission that we were given has been completed. And, sadly, the Nation has lost more than 4,400 brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who were engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It is time for us, for Congress and the American people, to formally recognize the end of America's 2002 mission in Iraq. This is an important first step. As Congress, once again, reasserts its responsibility in the use of our military forces by authorizing frameworks that address current threats to our Nation and that we authorize the use of military force only as the last resort.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. We need to exercise our Article I constitutional responsibilities and update this outdated AUMF. That is precisely what we are arguing today. We are not saying that we should replace this, but we shouldn't repeal without an updated AUMF that reflects the modern-day threats.

As I close later, I will talk about the chairman and I working on that effort. That is what this body should be doing, because otherwise, if we repeal this, we are again ceding our Article I responsibilities to the executive, and just giving him unlimited Article II powers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE), and I thank the gentlewoman for her bipartisan spirit in coming down to the floor today to speak on this AUMF.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle for giving me a minute on this issue. I want to thank our veterans that have given lifelong service to their country.

Nearly two decades ago, Congress authorized the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but ever since, three President's, both Republican and Democrat, have used this permission to drag out conflicts and to get us into new ones.

Americans who weren't even alive on 9/11 or during the invasion of Iraq are still fighting and dying there, in Syria, across Africa, and who knows where else. Our Founders wisely gave Congress the exclusive constitutional authority over whether our Nation goes to war.

Sadly, Congress has failed to perform this sacred duty for far too long. This is about restoring the powers set forth in Article I. Congress can go to war with anyone under Article I. When Washington drags us into a war, they aren't the ones who go do the fighting and dying, our children are. The very least we can do is give their parents a say in when and where and if their kids will fight and die thousands of miles away.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think I laid out our arguments, and I think it is irresponsible to repeal this authority, which still is used to protect our embassy diplomats and soldiers in Iraq against the Shia proxies of Iran.

I am committed to work with the chairman to update this outdated AUMF. And I think if there is any agreement in this Chamber, and also on both sides of the aisle, it is that we need to modernize it to the modern-day threats.

And as I read from the President's Statement of Administration Policy, the President says: I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure that outdated authorizations for the use of military force are replaced with a framework appropriate to ensure that we can continue to protect Americans from terrorist threats.

I agree with the President of the United States, and I think the chairman does as well. We have to do this, and it is not going to be easy, but it is time to update this outdated AUMF.

I would prefer to have repealed and replaced it with our updated AUMF. But as BRIAN MAST, a heroic veteran who lost his legs in battle, said, We cannot just repeal this and talk about updating when we haven't even talked to the Department of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the intelligence community about what is the modern-day threat, and what we need to do in Congress to exercise our Article I responsibilities that we have a responsibility to do, and not just cede everything to the executive branch under Article II.

The argument is made, well, this could be done under Article II. Well, that is probably true. But are we not abdicating our responsibility and ceding it to the executive branch by doing this? I would argue that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with the motion to recommit.

If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider my amendment to H.R. 256. It responds to the serious escalation by Hamas against Israel that we saw in May.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, Hamas launched over 4,000 rockets at our closest allies in the Middle East. This was a stark reminder of the dangerous threats that Israel faces from Hamas, Hezbollah, Iran, and other terrorist organizations.

For this reason, our MTR makes sure that the United States can quickly react to Israel's security needs in the event of future attacks.

If enacted, this language would establish contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles such as munitions, ISR technology, aircraft, and related services. It would also create a waiver to expedite arms transfers if Israel is under threat of military attack.

This language passed the House last Congress with broad bipartisan support, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it today.

I fear that the 2002 AUMF repeal we are considering today without a replacement may embolden our adversaries, especially Iran—the largest state sponsor of terror in the world—and its proxies by signaling that we are retreating from the Middle East.

Our MTR is intended to send a strong message that this is absolutely false. It will also send a message that passage will demonstrate our ironclad support for Israel and all our allies in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his hard work. As he has indicated, it is a pleasure working with him on this committee and working collectively and having open and honest dialog where we agree and where we disagree. The manner in which we do that, I think, serves this body in a very good way, and I look forward to continuing to work with him in that regard.

Even though we see this a little differently, I will say right now that I am

ready to work with the gentleman in repealing and replacing the 2001 AUMF. I think that is what we utilized as primary for the 2014 ISIS issue in dealing with all of the terrorists and terrorism that is going on. But the 2002 AUMF was specific to Iraq.

Our duty and our responsibility in what took place is over. There comes a time when certain AUMFs simply become outdated and need to be repealed. We are going to do two others. We have an AUMF still on the books from 1957. We have another one that is on the books from 1991. There is no need to repeal and replace. They are outdated. Once they become outdated, let's just remove them from the books.

So let me again reiterate this: the repealing of the 2002 AUMF would have no effect on any outgoing military operations in Iraq. In fact, the only thing leaving the AUMF on the books does is risk inviting future administrations to try to stretch its legal authority and bypass Congress' constitutional obligation to make decisions on matters of war and peace, thereby getting past and abdicating our responsibilities under Article I authority and allow the executive to interpret the AUMFs far beyond their intent.

So the repeal of the 2002 AUMF is only one in a series of steps that Congress must take to reclaim its Article I authority, but it is, indeed, an important step. Today's historic vote is a turning point to quickly bring an end to this outdated AUMF. I understand from listening to the Senate that the Senate's intention also is to quickly bring the 2002 AUMF repeal for a vote.

So I look forward to Congress no longer taking a backseat on some of the most consequential decisions our Nation can make.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Out of Iraq Caucus, and a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 256, which repeals the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq passed by Congress nearly twenty years ago on October 16, 2002 as Pub. L. 107-243.

I extend my thanks and deep appreciation to our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her tireless and unwavering devotion to repealing this misguided AUMF and acknowledging the grievous mistake history has shown it to be and as many of predicted at the time it would be.

Congress never intended for the 2002 AUMF to have such broad and extended reach.

Over the last 18 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use this legislation as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

The 2002 AUMF is an outdated piece of legislation and repealing it will not affect any current military operations.

Moreover, the 2002 AUMF is unnecessary because everything the 2002 AUMF covers is already fully covered under the 2001 9/11 AUMF, except for attacks against Iran.

Congress passed the 2002 AUMF to address the perceived threat posed by the re-

gime of Saddam Hussein and the AUMF permitted the President to use the armed forces as "necessary and appropriate" to "defend U.S. national security against the continuing threat posed by Iraq" and to "enforce all relevant Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq."

U.S. military deployments and operations carried out pursuant to the 2002 AUMF—dubbed Operation Iraqi Freedom—officially concluded in 2011.

Almost 18 years after the resolution's passage, the United States recognizes the sovereignty of Iraq and considers Iraq a key ally.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole duty to declare war and repealing obsolete Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMFs) is essential for Congress to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities.

Leaving the 2002 AUMF in place increases the likelihood that future presidents will use it as a basis to start a new war, or expand a current one, without Congress's explicit authorization.

In July 2019, the House adopted a Lee amendment to NDAA virtually identical to H.R. 256, To Repeal the AUMF Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, by a bipartisan vote of 242 to 180.

The overly broad 2002 AUMF represents deterioration of Congressional oversight.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

Congress must repeal the 2002 AUMF immediately to fulfill its constitutional obligation to provide oversight and consent on matters of war and peace.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, since the objectives which led Congress to pass the 2002 Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) have been achieved, I believe the authorization to use that military force expired automatically.

That is why thirteen years ago, on October 31, 2007, I introduced H.R. 4020, the "Military Success in Iraq Commemoration Act of 2007," which acknowledged and affirmed that the two objectives of the 2002 AUMF—(1) to defend the national security of the United States and (2) to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq—had in fact been achieved and called upon the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe a national day of celebration commemorating military success in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, where a Congressional authorization to use military force has expired, the President must obtain a new authorization to continue the use of force.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to expand military operations in the region, to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and our allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 18 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

More than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in the Persian Gulf exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Iraq.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the past and the legislation before us is directly aligned with the will of the American people.

I commend my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for introducing this legislation and urge all Members to vote for H.R. 256 and repeal the misguided and certainly outdated 2002 Authorization For Use of Military Force in Iraq.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 256, legislation to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 ("2002 AUMF").

This authorization has outlived its usefulness, if it ever had one. My position on the Iraq war has been clear: I opposed the occupation of Iraq and the damage it unleashed. We were wise to exit this quagmire while retaining the ability to address any legitimate security threats emanating from this region.

But we left the 2002 AUMF in place, which was a mistake. First the Obama Administration and now the Biden Administration have made clear it is no longer needed. As noted by the Biden Administration, "repeal of the 2002 AUMF would likely have minimal impact on current military operations."

Additionally, I share concerns that failure to repeal the 2002 AUMF will allow it to continue to be misused to legitimize U.S. military actions that were never contemplated when it was passed, including in areas far outside of Iraq.

It's time that Congress begins to reclaim its war powers. Repealing this outdated 2002 AUMF will also allow our country to refocus our military strategies and efforts towards defending against legitimate national security threats facing our country. We will never stop open ended war if we never reconsider the open-ended authorizations that are feeding them. The Constitution is clear about Congress' authority. These are difficult decisions but every time we punt on reasserting our authority regarding sending our men and women in uniform to war, we weaken our institution and our democracy.

Today's vote marks the fourth time in the past three years that the House has passed similar legislation in a bipartisan fashion. Today's action hopefully marks the last time we do so and that we will finally see this legislation enacted into law.

I support H.R. 256 and the termination of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 256, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCCAUL is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to provide assistance to the Government of Israel in order to help enable Israel to defend itself by itself and develop long-term capacity, primarily through the acquisition of advanced capabilities that are available from the United States.

SEC. 3. CONTINGENCY PLANS TO PROVIDE ISRAEL WITH NECESSARY DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.

The President shall establish and update as appropriate contingency plans to provide Israel with defense articles and defense services that are determined by the President to be necessary for the defense of Israel.

SEC. 4. WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) WAIVER FOR EXISTING OR IMMINENT MILITARY THREAT TO ISRAEL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving information that Israel is under an existing or imminent threat of military attack, the President may waive the requirements of this Act and direct the immediate transfer to Israel of such defense articles or defense services the President determines to be necessary to assist Israel in its defense against such threat. Amounts obligated or expended to carry out this paragraph shall not be subject to any limitation in law, or provision of any bilateral agreement, relating to the amount of United States assistance authorized to be made available to Israel.

“(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after a transfer of defense articles or defense services pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (1), the President shall provide a notification in writing to Congress of the details of such transfer, consistent with the requirements of section 36 of this Act.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 219, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—204

Aderholt	Gohmert	Moore (AL)
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Murphy (NC)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Nehls
Babin	Gosar	Newhouse
Bacon	Granger	Norman
Baird	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Obernolte
Banks	Greene (GA)	Owens
Barr	Griffith	Palazzo
Bentz	Grothman	Palmer
Bergman	Guest	Pence
Bice (OK)	Guthrie	Perry
Biggs	Hagedorn	Pfluger
Billirakis	Harris	Posey
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Reed
Boebert	Hern	Reschenthaler
Bost	Herrell	Rodgers (WA)
Brady	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brooks	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Buck	Hill	Rosendale
Bucshon	Hinson	Rouzer
Budd	Hollingsworth	Roy
Burchett	Hudson	Rutherford
Burgess	Huizenga	Salazar
Calvert	Issa	Scalise
Cammack	Jackson	Schweikert
Carl	Jacobs (NY)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Sessions
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Cawthorn	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cloud	Katko	Spartz
Clyde	Keller	Staubert
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Steel
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Steil
Crenshaw	Kinzinger	Steube
Curtis	Kustoff	Stewart
Davidson	LaHood	Taylor
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Tenney
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Tiffany
Donalds	LaTurner	Timmons
Duncan	Lesko	Turner
Dunn	Letlow	Upton
Emmer	Long	Valadao
Estes	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Feenstra	Lucas	Van Duyne
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Walberg
Fitzgerald	Mann	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fox	McClain	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Westerman
Scott	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Fulcher	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wittman
Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Womack
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	Young
Garcia (CA)	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
Gibbs	Moolenaar	
Gimenez	Mooney	

NAYS—219

Adams	Carson	Dean
Agullar	Carter (LA)	DeFazio
Allred	Cartwright	DeGette
Auchincloss	Case	DeLauro
Axne	Casten	DelBene
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Delgado
Bass	Castro (TX)	Demings
Beatty	Chu	DeSaulnier
Bera	Cicilline	Deuch
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Escobar
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bonamici	Cohen	Espallat
Bourdeaux	Connolly	Evans
Bowman	Cooper	Fletcher
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Foster
F.	Costa	Frankel, Lois
Brown	Courtney	Galleo
Brownley	Craig	Garamendi
Bush	Crist	Garcia (IL)
Bustos	Crow	Garcia (TX)
Butterfield	Cuellar	Golden
Carbajal	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny K.	

Gonzalez, Vicente	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Sánchez
Gotthelmer	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes
Green, Al (TX)	Manning	Scanlon
Grijalva	Massie	Schakowsky
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schiff
Hayes	McBath	Schneider
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Schrader
Himes	McEachin	Schrier
Horsford	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Houlahan	McNerney	Scott, David
Hoyer	Meeks	Sewell
Huffman	Meng	Sherman
Jackson Lee	Mfume	Sherrill
Jacobs (CA)	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jayapal	Morelle	Slotkin
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Mrvan	Soto
Johnson (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Spanberger
Jones	Nadler	Speier
Kahele	Napolitano	Stansbury
Kaptur	Neal	Stanton
Keating	Neguse	Stevens
Kelly (IL)	Newman	Strickland
Khanna	Norcross	Suozi
Kildee	O'Halleran	Swalwell
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano
Kim (NJ)	Omar	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Panetta	Titus
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Tlaib
Kuster	Pascrell	Tonko
Lamb	Payne	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Perlmuter	Trahan
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Trone
Larson (CT)	Phillips	Underwood
Lawrence	Pingree	Vargas
Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Porter	Vela
Lee (NV)	Pressley	Velázquez
Leger Fernandez	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Levin (CA)	Quigley	Schultz
Levin (MI)	Raskin	Waters
Lieu	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Ross	Welch
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wexton
Luria	Ruiz	Wild
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Williams (GA)
Mace	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Malinowski	Ryan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Doyle, Michael	Green (TN)	Rice (SC)
F.	Harshbarger	Torres (NY)
Fallon	McHenry	

□ 1102

Messrs. CASE, MRVAN, STANTON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ZELDIN, DAVIDSON, HOLLINGSWORTH, and BUDD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, due to a committee hearing with Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, I was unable to make rollcall Vote 171 on the Motion to Recommit offered by Mr. McCaul of Texas. I would like the record to note that I would have supported the Motion to Recommit and have a long history of supporting our ally, Israel.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas	Gonzalez, Vicente	Kim (NJ)
(Gomez)	(Pallone)	
Cicilline	(Gomez)	Kirkpatrick
(Pingree)	Granger	(Stanton)
Cleaver (Davids	(Arrington)	Langevin
(KS))	Grijalva (García	(Courtney)
DeSaulnier	(IL))	Lawson (FL)
(Thompson	Himes	(Evans)
(CA))	(Courtney)	Lieu (Raskin)
Frankel, Lois	Hoyer (Brown)	Lowenthal
(Clark (MA))	Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)
Gimenez (Waltz)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Clark
	Kahele (Mrvan)	(MA))

Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)

Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)

Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BONAMICI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 161, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—268

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene

Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster

Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley

Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suzoi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany

NAYS—161

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Calvert
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)

Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Malliotakis
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Green (TN)

McHenry

□ 1127

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I was forced to miss votes on June 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170,

“yea” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Ciilline
(Pingree)
Cleaver (Davids
(KS))
DeSaulnier
(Thompson
(CA))
Frankel, Lois
(Clark (MA))
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Gomez)
Granger
(Arrington)
Grijalva (Garcia
(IL))
Harshbarger
(Kustoff)
Himes
(Courtney)

Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kim (NJ)
(Pallone)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Courtney)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu (Raskin)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Meng (Clark
(MA))
Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)

Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)
Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

□ 1130

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DISPARITY AND FAIRNESS IN GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members to the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth:

Mr. HIMES, Connecticut, Chair
Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio
Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. JAYAPAL, Washington
Ms. CRAIG, Minnesota
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
Ms. JACOBS, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the House majority whip the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman letting me stand in today for the majority leader.

Next week, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete

list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider:

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which would make it easier for those who have suffered age discrimination in the workplace to file a complaint and seek redress;

H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, which would ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau keep statistics on credit reporting for LGBTQ-owned businesses in the same way as it does for women- and minority-owned companies and small businesses; and

H.R. 239, Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, which would allow women receiving healthcare services from the VA system to access basic contraceptive care without paying copays similar to coverage provided under the Affordable Care Act.

We will consider three resolutions of disapproval to reverse regulatory actions made under the prior administration, which have all been passed by the Senate:

S.J. Res. 13 would reverse the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's rule that had obscured information about the factual and legal basis the Commission used to make determinations on discriminatory practices;

S.J. Res. 14 would overturn the prior administration's Environmental Protection Agency rule that removed protections from dangerous methane emissions that exacerbate the climate crisis; and

S.J. Res. 15 would overturn a rule by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and allow States once again to regulate these lenders and protect consumers in order to rein in predatory lenders and rent-a-bank schemes.

MR. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for walking us through those. Of course, I would first like to, as we note that the majority leader is not here, wish Mr. HOYER a speedy recovery. I got to speak with him yesterday, and he is doing better and appreciates the prayers and thoughts from our colleagues.

And I told him: You don't have to rush back. You want to make sure you get better before you come back.

And I know from experience to take the time and get better. And I offered, by the way, use of my physical therapist, and maybe he and I will do some joint physical therapy when he returns. But he was in good spirits and is looking forward to coming back. I know the gentleman from South Carolina shares that as well.

MR. CLYBURN. Absolutely.

MR. SCALISE. I am sure the gentleman from Maryland is watching right now as he is recovering, but I said, we are used to sparring and having some fun conversations back and forth through the Select Subcommittee

on the Coronavirus, but we also look forward to seeing him back in the middle of this fray soon, too.

If I may, I did want to ask. There were a couple of bills that deal with the origin of the coronavirus, and I know we have been having those conversations about trying to get a deeper investigation into the origin of the coronavirus. But the Senate had passed over a few weeks ago a bill, S. 1867, that came out of the Senate unanimously back in May, which requires the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information that relates to the origin of COVID-19.

I am not sure if this is a bill that you all were looking at bringing up, but we wanted to just ask if we could have S. 1867 brought to the House floor. It was a bill that passed unanimously out of the Senate, which does indicate that there was strong interest on both sides to get that information declassified so we can get more information about the origin of COVID for all of our Members to be able to see, not just those Members that have access to that information.

I am not sure, again, if the gentleman was looking at that, but if that is something you all could look at, I think it would be well received by both sides, and then would help us quickly get that information available for all to see.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

MR. CLYBURN. You and I have been having this discussion for quite a while with our select subcommittee activities. I have not seen the legislation that you make reference to, but I am sure that the majority leader has. And, like you, I am looking forward to his speedy recovery so he can get back into this spot. I am a little more familiar with sparring with you in our select subcommittee than on this floor.

But having said that, I think you are aware that the Biden administration has already directed the United States intelligence community to examine this issue, calling on the intelligence community to redouble their efforts to report their findings by August 24 and to keep Congress fully apprised of their work.

We have confidence in their ability to conduct a robust evidence-based inquiry into the origin of the coronavirus and will not allow House Republicans to irresponsibly hijack this issue for partisan purposes. We want to see this thing happen, and you and I have had this discussion. And because they have got until August 24—that is, what, 3 months from now, or less—I think we will be in a good place to let the Intelligence Committee do its work.

MR. SCALISE. There is an old adage: "Why put off tomorrow what you can do today?"

There is unanimous support for S. 1867 to not wait until August. And, in fact, it was May when Senators—all Republicans and all Democrat Senators—recognized that this is some-

thing we should do and we should do now, and this would get more information out to the public, as well as to our Members.

I would also ask if the majority would look at H. Res. 90, which is a resolution that supports the international investigation into the origin of COVID-19.

There are many countries. We have heard a lot of European countries have expressed interest in having an international commission to look into this. I don't know why the United States would be reluctant to be a part of that investigation.

But, again, in light of all of the new information that has come out, some emails recently since our committee has met, show more and more that there is a high likelihood that COVID-19 started in the Wuhan lab. Whether it was intentional or not, there is strong evidence pointing to the fact that it likely started there.

We have not had a single hearing, not any of the standing committees, and here we have a committee that, by its name, the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus was established for the purpose of investigating COVID-19, all elements of it, not just what is happening here in America.

We just recognized over 600,000 deaths from COVID-19 on the steps of the Capitol just a few days ago. So, clearly, it has hit our country hard, but it has hit the whole world hard. Millions of people have died. And now there is real evidence that has come out, including from some of our own scientists here in America, that they may have been aware over a year ago that COVID-19 originated in the lab as opposed to what the original projections were that it was a bat-to-human transmission. Now there is a lot of evidence pointing to the opposite of that.

In fact, many of us were calling for that investigation over a year ago, and some were called conspiracy theorists, yet now the hard scientific data shows that it may have been, in fact, started in that lab.

Why are we not having those hearings now in our committee, other committees, again, not months from now?

But if China knew of this, there may not be scientists that we can get access to, but we have American scientists who were in communication with those scientists. Whether it is directly or indirectly, there may have been taxpayer funds that were involved in that. We should be trying to find that out now. And China may be trying to cover some of that up.

The quicker we can get those hearings and those investigations, the more we can find out while it is still possible to find it out. I think it would help a lot of us to understand what really happened, what went wrong.

Because if it was started in that lab, this would be a disaster dramatically greater than Chernobyl in terms of devastation to the world, loss of human life. We should all want to be finding

out. There were a lot of investigations into Chernobyl. This is dramatically worse than Chernobyl. And if it was self-made, that is something we should be investigating now. I am not sure why there is a reluctance to do it.

But I would ask the gentleman, if I could just reiterate, I know we sent a letter—over 200 of our colleagues signed on—asking that we investigate it, all the committees of jurisdiction, including ours.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that I am as anxious to know exactly what happened as he is. And the American people want to know exactly what happened. The fact of the matter is, though, we have several committees that are investigating, including the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have indicated that they intend to look into the matter.

Now, like you, I am from the South, and you can get too many cooks in the kitchen. And I am fully aware that to have a plethora of committees stumbling over each other trying to get to the bottom of this will serve no useful purpose.

So I want to see things done here as close to regular order as we possibly can have them done, and to let the committees of jurisdiction conduct their investigation, this administration working through its intelligence department doing the investigations, and I am sure they will come up with the kind of information that would do us as citizens and as Members of this great body justice.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we will continue to press for that investigation.

And, you know, I am from New Orleans, and I know what it is like to have cooks in the kitchen, but I also know how important it is to have a lot of eyes looking at the same thing. And the more eyes looking into something where there is mystery, where there is uncertainty, where there is speculation, I think the more people looking at this, the better.

Again, our committee is uniquely set up. There are other committees that are set up to look at different aspects of it. We should all be looking at it because the more questions we ask—it seems like right now more questions are raised. We need to get answers to those questions, and we get those answers by having that oversight hearing. We don't want some kind of Soviet-style coverup. We want to be looking at those questions and having people brought in.

There are American scientists, some people who work for this United States Government, who could help us answer those questions, and they haven't been brought forward. We can compel them to come forward, especially in light of these emails that have come out recently, which show that some of those scientists were aware over a year ago that it may have started in the lab.

□ 1145

That was not shared with us in previous hearings. I think a lot of our Members on both sides would like to find that information out as much as we can. And the more we are asking questions, the more I think we will get answers that everybody in the country and around the world wants to know. So, we will continue to press for that.

I also want to ask about the appropriations process. I understand the Committee on Appropriations is starting to do some work to start bringing up the bills in committee so that we can, hopefully, have an appropriations process move forward. We would be strongly encouraging a bipartisan appropriations process but also an open appropriations process.

So, as we look to the floor schedule, we are hearing that maybe in July some of these bills would come to the floor. As the gentleman knows, when we bring appropriations bills to the floor, whether it is a fully open process or even a modified process, you typically have well over 100 amendments that come to the floor on these appropriations bills.

Does the gentleman anticipate that we would start, around July, seeing some of those bills come to the floor? And will we have that ability on the floor to have those kinds of amendments brought forward in a process that we have seen in the past?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Committee on Appropriations has announced that it will start its process next week with four subcommittee markups. Over the next 2 weeks, and then the week of July 12, the committee will complete subcommittee and full committee markups on all 12 of the annual appropriations bills.

We plan to consider the bills on the floor the final 2 weeks of July, when we are in session. That will be the week of July 19 and July 26.

Now, I suspect that we will be close to what the gentleman just indicated he would like to see with the schedule. I am certain that the Committee on Appropriations will do everything it possibly can to keep that schedule so that we will complete all of our work before the August break.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and we look forward to that robust process through both committee and, ultimately, on the floor.

The last point, I wanted to ask about deals with infrastructure. We are seeing a lot of different groups both in the House and Senate that are working on various infrastructure plans. I know we had Members on our side, Ranking Member GRAVES and others, who rolled out a plan recently that covers traditional infrastructure, which would be roads and bridges—even broadband, waterways—paid for along the way, not with tax increases but with responsible budgeting.

I wanted to ask because we are hearing different reports on what may or may not come to the House floor. Budget reconciliation, possibly, and tax increases, unfortunately, are still being floated out there, which is different from what we are hearing right now with the bipartisan Senate plan.

Can the gentleman shed light on what is anticipated on the floor, whether it would be a budget reconciliation bill in the weeks or months ahead or maybe a bipartisan plan, which we would surely encourage, laying out some ideas of infrastructure that would be bipartisan that we would support?

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could answer that, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman is aware that I am very anxious about doing things in a bipartisan way when that can be achieved.

Now, the majority leader has announced that during the week of June 28, the House will take up the INVEST in America Act, a 5-year surface transportation reauthorization bill that was approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by a bipartisan vote.

I think the gentleman is aware of the pretty long session, all-night session, that both parties in that committee undertook. I think that they have produced a product that will make these key investments in smart, safe, sustainable, and resilient transportation infrastructure that is needed by the American people to move goods and services throughout our country efficiently, effectively, and equitably. I could not go through this colloquy with the gentleman and not invoke those three words that he is so familiar with.

Now, at the same time, we must remember that our Nation's infrastructure is comprised of far more than roads and bridges. I often talk about the advent of the internet. I could remember when it first came on the scene, everybody referred to the internet as the "information superhighway." I have always advocated that it is time for us to start treating the information highway the same way we treat the interstate highways.

So, I agree with the gentleman that we should move with an infrastructure bill, but I want him to know that I think it is important that the Accessible, Affordable Internet for All Act is a part of that.

I know this debate has been going on as to whether or not we ought to move on a bipartisan bill that focuses on traditional infrastructure. For anything to be traditional, it has to be in our past, but I think it is time for us to be looking to the future when we talk about infrastructure and to have an infrastructure bill come through this body that focuses on the future of healthcare, which cannot be efficient, effective, or equitable without broadband.

Online learning is a must for our children. We know COVID-19, according to all the experts, may not be the last time that we are faced with such a pandemic. There are some predicting that there could come another, maybe not in my lifetime but maybe in yours. We must be prepared.

So, I am hopeful that this infrastructure bill that we move through this body will not just be traditional but will be looking to the future so we can have the kind of legislation that will prepare our children and grandchildren for a world that we hope they will be competitive in.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Hopefully, we can have that debate and work together to achieve that vision for the future as we are dealing with the problems of today and our infrastructure needs for today, but also do it in a fiscally responsible way. I think that is what the two sides, especially in the Senate, are looking at.

I still haven't gotten an indication, specifically, as it deals with some kind of reconciliation bill that may or may not come to the floor. Hopefully, it is not some attempt to raise taxes and do things that would undermine our economy, our competitiveness, and our ability to create more opportunities for people to achieve the American Dream by entering into the workforce and ultimately moving their way up and having their own opportunities as well, which would be undermined with higher taxes.

If that part of the equation gets brought in, clearly, that changes the dynamic. But, hopefully, we stick to the traditional infrastructure needs that you and I would both agree need to be met. Hopefully, we can find a path to get there together. That is what we will be working toward in the week ahead.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has nothing else, I am prepared to yield back.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything else. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to stand in here today.

I say to him that I would hope that as we go forward with this discussion, we will look at this whole issue as the title of the bill indicates: Invest in America. When we make investments, financial investments, the money may leave our coffers, but it comes back sometimes tenfold.

So there is a big difference between raising taxes and making investments.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, we can keep that difference in mind.

I appreciate the gentleman filling in, and we will see the gentleman from Maryland back soon enough and maybe even moving a little faster than before. I am not going to challenge him to a race because he would defeat me in that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina, and I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOMMITTING ON JUNETEENTH

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1865, freedom finally came for the last enslaved African Americans in the United States when Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, more than 2 years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation.

Today, 156 years later, President Biden will be signing a law to make Juneteenth a new Federal holiday. It is a cause for celebration. It should also serve as an occasion for learning and for this country to reflect on our history and recommit to doing the vital work to ensure that the lasting effects of slavery, bigotry, and racism are replaced with hope, dignity, and equality for all.

We can start with the Senate passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, legislation to reform policing and address systemic racism and bias within law enforcement, and finally making the John Lewis Voting Rights Act a law, passing it.

Today, we celebrate this historic designation of Juneteenth as a Federal holiday. Tomorrow, we get back to work.

BIDEN INFLATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the hidden tax that is plaguing hardworking Americans. This hidden tax is inflation.

Under President Biden, we have seen the largest spike in 13 years, with consumer prices surging 5 percent in May. Core inflation rose at its fastest pace since 1992.

American families are being forced to pay more for the products that they need. Gasoline is 56.2 percent more expensive today than 12 months ago. Transportation services have increased 11.2 percent. Together, food and energy prices have increased 3.8 percent. Even used cars and truck prices have increased 29.7 percent.

Yet, Democrats rammed through a trillion-dollar package that is crushing small businesses and hurting hardworking American families by incentivizing Americans to stay at home and not get back to work. We are currently down 7.6 million jobs from our pre-pandemic levels. Our inflation is rising because of President Biden's far-left tax-and-spend proposals.

Americans cannot afford the Biden inflation tax. We know wasteful government spending will not solve this crisis, no matter how many times President Biden and the Democrats propose it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANITA EHLERS

(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Anita Ehlers, a constituent member of the Barrington, Illinois, community I represent and, more importantly, a friend.

I never knew Anita when she didn't have cancer. But for a long time, I didn't know that she did. She just never let it define who she was.

I knew her as a wonderfully kind, hardworking woman who was committed to making the world a better place.

Our Speaker often reminds us: "We don't agonize. We organize." Every time she says it, I see Anita's face in my head.

I never saw her feel sorry for herself. Every time I was with her, it seemed like all the thoughts in her head were on how to make the world a little better for everybody else: her husband, Gregg; her daughters, Julia and Lindsay; her friends and neighbors; me and all the folks she was motivating.

As a women's marcher, a climate protector, an ally for the LBGT community, a universal health coverage champion, a union member, a teacher, and a lung cancer support advocate, she never agonized. She organized.

The world, and our district, is a sadder place without her. But I take inspiration because she always made our community a better place.

May we all find the strength to follow her example, to make the world around us a little easier for everybody else, no matter the adversity that we may personally face.

1200

PREPARATIONS TO EVACUATE AFGHAN INTERPRETERS

(Mr. MEIJER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the dire situation of our interpreters in Afghanistan, where we are over halfway through our planned withdrawal. Meanwhile, almost 20,000 Afghans who worked with U.S. forces are anxiously awaiting special immigrant visa approval, a process that can take years. Making matters worse, our Kabul Embassy suspended visa operations last week due to a surge in COVID cases.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden must immediately start preparations to evacuate those Afghans to Guam to safely await visa approval. My colleagues and I on the Honoring our Promises Working Group urged the administration to do so 2 weeks ago, but we have yet to hear back. This is unacceptable.

President Biden ended the remain in Mexico for economic migrants but insists on a remain in Afghanistan policy

for Afghans who risked their lives to help American forces. While they wait, the Taliban are hunting them down. Dozens have already been killed while bureaucrats dither.

We cannot abandon our Afghan allies to die. We must get them to Guam.

ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE AND CLEAN ENERGY

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we cannot unravel infrastructure from climate. As we consider bold new investments in America's infrastructure, our choices will shape our climate future for better or worse.

Failing to address climate pollution and clean energy in our infrastructure work will force future generations of Americans to cover a blank check. And we are already passing on grave and growing costs for our past failures to act.

But let me put this another way: seizing opportunities to tackle climate change in our infrastructure work will help us build legislation that makes America cleaner, safer, and more competitive as a Nation. It will save countless lives and create millions of good American jobs.

If we make climate a priority, our workers will miss fewer days on the job, and our kids will miss fewer days at school. Our local budgets will suffer less strain. Our infrastructure dollars will go farther. The things we build will last longer.

Climate is a growing threat that demands urgent, bold action. And doing nothing about it is doing something, it is condemning the United States to become a weaker, sicker, and poorer Nation. This is our path to choose. Do we allow America to further decline or choose a more sustainable, prosperous, and just future? To me, the decision is clear: Let's move forward.

CRISIS AT THE BORDER

(Ms. HERRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter and these photos, in fact, more photos than just this, from a constituent. The photos were taken on his ranch at 5 a.m. earlier this week from a game camera about 15 miles north of the border.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Russell Johnson dated June 13, 2021, and I would like to read a few excerpts from the letter.

"When President Biden signed the proclamation ending border wall construction, we saw a dramatic increase in illegal foot traffic through our ranch."

I can no longer allow my children to play outside unless an adult is with them to mon-

itor the areas around them. People who have dropped out of groups crossing have stopped at my house wanting to use the phone, WiFi, and call their smuggler. This is very concerning, as often my wife is at home alone with our children, and I am hours away working on the ranch. These people are desperate. And it is only a matter of time before someone gets hurt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the border in New Mexico is not like the other borders in cities around El Paso or the ports of entry, here there is a huge difference.

JUNE 13, 2021.

REPRESENTATIVE HERRELL. My name is Russell Johnson. I am a fourth-generation cattle rancher in southern Luna County. I ranch along side my wife, two children, my father, and my mother. Our ranch borders the international boundary with Mexico for a little over 8 miles. My family has ranched on this same piece of land since 1918. What we are experiencing on the border today is not only a risk to my family, but our state and this nation.

When President Biden signed the proclamation ending border wall construction, we saw a dramatic increase in illegal foot traffic through our ranch. There now exists a gap in the wall that separates the United States from Mexico on our ranch. It is approximately 3/4-mile wide along with a border monument access gate that was not installed leaving a gap about 12 feet wide. Not only did President Biden's proclamation end the construction of the physical barrier, but it also stopped all other infrastructure and technology that was to go with it. Improved access roads for Border Patrol, lighting, sensor technology and camera systems were all part of the project that was abruptly ended. The situation at the border has progressively worsened because of this decision. Talking with local Border Patrol Agents, group size in our area has gone from four to six people in a group, to now being upwards of twenty. This is all crossing and passing through not only my property, but our homes and business.

I can no longer allow my children to play outside unless an adult is with them to monitor the areas around them. People who have dropped out of groups crossing have stopped at my house wanting to use the phone or have access to my Wi-Fi to call their smuggler. This is very concerning as often my wife is at home alone with our children and I am hours away working on the ranch. These people are desperate. It's only a matter of time before our home is broken into.

The increase in traffic is also affecting our business. Much of southern New Mexico is suffering a D4 drought. We are having to supplement our cattle to get to the monsoon season. This hardship is being compounded by the people crossing the border illegally. Currently, we have decent natural grasses in the pasture bordering Mexico. Our cattle are not utilizing this rangeland properly because they are constantly getting spooked by the people crossing. This is pushing them into drier areas with not enough suitable feed for them to consume. The cattle are also susceptible to contracting stress induced illnesses like Pasteurella Pneumonia from constantly being run off. We have experienced this before under similar border conditions. If not treated quickly, cattle can die within 48 hours. We are experiencing this not only on parts of the ranch that border Mexico, but further north as well.

Our day-to-day operations have been negatively impacted. We now try to work in pairs at a minimum. With no cellphone service in our area, it is safer to work with someone with you, so you have somebody to watch your back. This slows our work progress

down and increases the length of time it takes to get tasks down.

On June 4, 2021, my father and I encountered four groups of illegal immigrants on our ranch totaling well over 30 individuals. Border Patrol was able to apprehend all four groups, but they told me something that I found very troubling. They said that there were only eight agents in the field that evening. Deming Border Patrol Station is responsible for the area we live in. The station's area of responsibility includes well over 60 miles of border. Eight agents were expected to cover all of that during their shift. This does not make for a very secure border. Encountering groups crossing and a lack of manpower in the field is becoming the norm. The Patrol Agent in Charge at the Deming Border Patrol Station told us that they are averaging 650 apprehensions a week. These are apprehensions, they do not include the people that are successfully making their illegal entry.

It is important to note that we do not have unaccompanied minors or family groups crossing through our area. They are all young, adult males in good physical shape. All the people I have encountered are wearing full camouflage, to include face coverings and carpet or sponge booties on their feet. These people are not turning themselves in, they do not want to be caught.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time we have experienced issues regarding the border. What differs this time from others is that our government is not trying to do anything to resolve the issue. I feel like as a citizen of this country, I do not matter in the eyes of our government. The State of Texas has declared a state of emergency in many if not all its counties that border Mexico. Texas is doing this because the Federal Government is not addressing the issue. Enough pressure will be put on the Texas border that New Mexico will see an even larger increase in illegal traffic as it will be pushed west. This bothers me greatly.

I am writing you today to make you aware of the situation on the border in our area and to ask for help. Border Patrol manpower is strained, and our local law enforcement is stretched thin. Ideally, the border wall and all infrastructure and technology need completed. In the meantime, we desperately need more boots on the ground to help with this surge in illegal traffic. We also need better cellphone coverage in these remote areas. Not being able to call for law enforcement or emergency service is a huge safety concern. Last, but certainly not least, we need help getting this administration to address the border crisis. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Respectfully,

RUSSELL JOHNSON.

HONORING WILLIAM ALLEN PULLUM

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of William Allen Pullum.

Navarre is a community in my district in Florida that is one of the fastest growing. It is vibrant, full of warfighters, workers, and lovely people. Bill Pullum is the father of Navarre.

He was born in 1947 and lived most of his life in this community. He joined the Army in 1967 as an Army helicopter

pilot and earned the Silver and Bronze Stars, as well as two Distinguished Flying Crosses in Vietnam before being honorably discharged in 1970.

He was involved in every aspect of life from real estate to business development, chambers of commerce, Kiwanis Clubs. There was hardly a cause in Navarre that Bill Pullum and his family did not support.

He was dedicated as a family member, a husband, a father, and was instrumental in mission work in Honduras throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the late Bill Pullum for his life of service to our country and to the community in my district.

RECOGNIZING DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL CHAMPIONS

(Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 5, the Dickinson High School girls softball team capped off an extraordinary season by winning the North Dakota Class A State Championship.

Dickinson had 13 hits, and Mataya Mortensen's dominant pitching performance led to the team's first-ever State title. Dickinson's 10-0 win was their 30th in 33 games. Mortensen surrendered only two hits in the shutout. And senior Paige Balliet ended the game with a walk-off double to trigger the 10-run run.

Dickinson finished the season with 30 and 3. They had 487 hits, 110 doubles, 19 triples, and 51 home runs. Their team batting average was .464, and they averaged 14.5 runs a game, contrasted with a team ERA of 1.42 and 250 strikeouts in 196 innings.

Both Taya Hoplauf and Jenna Decker were named to the all-State team, and Coach Amanda Mickey was named coach of the year.

Congratulations to the entire team on a great year, especially Paige Balliet and Madison McChesney.

HONORING DR. STEPHEN PRESCOTT

(Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Dr. Stephen Prescott, former Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation president.

Dr. Prescott served OMRF with outstanding leadership for 15 years, building the institution into what it is today. He dedicated his life to a scientific career, immersed in medical research, and loved traveling the world, often in conjunction with his professional commitments. But what he loved more than anything was his wife of 52 years, Susan, his two children and grandchildren.

During his time at OMRF, Dr. Prescott oversaw the largest campus expansion in the foundation's history, making the facility one of only 11 Autoimmunity Centers of Excellence in the United States.

Throughout his career, he received numerous awards, authored more than 250 scientific articles, served on the NIH, and even founded a biotech company. As a direct result of his many years of hard work and accomplishments, he was inducted into the Oklahoma Hall of Fame in 2020.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Prescott made an immense impact on OMRF, and as a result, the lives of thousands of Oklahomans. As a leading facility for health research, I want Americans to know how instrumental his role was in creating a facility where researchers are working hard to understand and develop new treatments for diseases like cancer, heart disease, and aging.

I am honored to recognize Dr. Prescott, and I am grateful for the profound impact he has had on my district and far beyond. He will be greatly missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RAYMOND TRUJILLO

(Mr. DONALDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONALDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Raymond Trujillo, a patriotic American, a United States marine, and a dutiful officer in Collier County, Florida. He tragically passed away in May at the age of 56 years old.

Raymond dedicated his life to giving back through service. He joined the United States Marine Corps as a teenager. Devoted to the Marine Corps creed, *semper fidelis*, Raymond spent 17 years in the military proudly serving our Nation.

Upon his exit from the military, Raymond continued his service in his community by becoming a police officer with the Collier County Sheriff's office, to which he would serve the Collier County community for more than 20 years.

Alongside his brothers and sisters in blue, Raymond protected the Collier County community for more than 20 years. For years, he worked in the Youth Relations Bureau helping to mold and shape the children of today and the future leaders of tomorrow.

Growing up in California, Raymond was a lifelong Oakland Raiders fan and loved the game of football, so much so he spent his spare time coaching youth football.

In a moment of history where police officers are vilified, hated, and looked down upon, Raymond Trujillo wore the badge with honor, dignity, and respect.

Raymond was a proud father to three sons, Raymond III, Alexander, and Jason, and a loving grandfather of three, who were his pride and joy.

My prayers are with his fellow marines, his brothers and sisters in blue, and his family.

As the Representative of Florida's 19th Congressional District, it is an honor to stand here today celebrating the life of an American patriot who dedicated his life to a simple, yet so often forgotten creed: Service above Self.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF OTTO WARMBIER

(Mrs. KIM of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Otto Frederick Warmbier as we approach the fourth anniversary of his tragic death on June 19, 2017.

Otto was a kind and studious young man, raised in Ohio, was salutatorian of his high school and attended the University of Virginia. At the age of 22, he was imprisoned and tortured by the North Korean regime following a school tour in 2015 and died a few days after he was released.

Mr. Warmbier experienced what no American or human being should ever have to go through. The United States will not back down from holding the North Korean regime accountable for human rights abuses.

As one of the first Korean-American women to serve in Congress and a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I will continue to do my part to advocate for global human rights and hold violators accountable.

We remember and honor Otto, always.

RECENT UPTICK IN INFLATION IN OUR COUNTRY

(Mr. OBERNOLTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to note with great alarm the recent uptick in inflation in our country.

Last month, the Consumer Price Index rose over 5 percent, which is over 2½ times the Fed's target rate for inflation in our country.

The price of lumber—although, thankfully, it has declined the last week—is still over three times what it was just a few months ago. The price of fuel is over 50 percent higher. And that mirrors the price of many commodities from corn to soybeans.

This is alarming, not just from a macroeconomic standpoint, but most importantly, from the standpoint of the constituents we represent. The Members of this Chamber might be able to afford to spend 50 percent more to fill the tank of their car, but unfortunately, many of the people we represent cannot. And that burden of inflation is an unseen tax on the least advantaged members of our society, the members of the lower class, and the working poor.

Economists tell us that this uptick in inflation is directly related to the

spending policies of our government, and we need to get our fiscal house in order to prevent this in the future.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AUCHINCLOSS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

□ 1215

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL SAMUEL LOMBARDO

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the life of Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

Sam and his family legally immigrated to the United States from Italy. He enlisted to serve in the Army National Guard's 28th Infantry Division just 1 month following the start of World War II.

After training, he was deployed to Europe where he would serve as platoon leader and executive officer of I Company, 394th Infantry Regiment, 99th Division, and he would always remind constituents in northwest Florida that he fought in the Battle of the Bulge.

During this time, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo and his platoon created their own makeshift flag out of scraps of red and blue cloth. For the white, they used German surrender flags. They used this as their battle flag in victorious campaigns across the Rhine and Danube Rivers.

Following World War II, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo continued his service to our country in Korea and Vietnam.

Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Lombardo earned the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with "V" for Valor, as well as an Oak Leaf Cluster with Meritorious Achievement among 10 other medals.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the late Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Lombardo.

I asked Sam how he was able to be so healthy after more than 100 years living on the planet Earth. He said that his secret was red wine and almonds at night. I think I will have a little of both in his honor this evening.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

RECOGNIZING MUSCATINE HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a high school in my district that was recently recognized for their commitment to student success.

For over 15 years, Iowa has partnered with the ACT's college application campaign to increase the number of first-generation college students and students from low-income households in applying for and pursuing higher education.

I am proud to announce that, in 2020, 176 Iowa schools participated in the college application campaign, and all together, 504 students completed 1,578 college applications. Of the 176 schools that participated, Muscatine High School in my district was awarded the 2020 School of Excellence Award for Iowa from ACT. Muscatine was selected for this great award based on their commitment to student success and for serving as an exemplary model for Iowa's college application campaign.

Congratulations to the students and faculty at Muscatine for being leaders in academic achievement and for serving as a great role model for student success in Iowa and the entire Nation.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is wonderful to hear that about Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

NEW SPENDING INITIATIVES

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GOHMERT for yielding to me.

For anyone who is not particularly familiar, we have sort of mechanisms. Last night, we were running late, and once we hit 10 o'clock, we were shut off. And trying to do 21 boards in 8 minutes, I apologize to those who have to try to take our words down.

But I wanted to just touch on a couple of things. One really quickly, we were just blessed to have Secretary Yellen in front of Ways and Means. I have tremendous respect for and have built a relationship with her when she was Federal Reserve Chair.

I want us all to pay attention to a promise that the Secretary and the President have made, and that is the new spending initiatives will be covered by the new taxes, the new revenues. I assume that is an honorable way to do it. We will fight over what the spending priorities are, and none of these games where we are going to do 15 years of tax hikes to cover 10 years of spending because, let's be honest, that is a complete fraud on the American people.

But the best math that is coming out from a number of groups right now is the tax hikes that are being proposed, the revenues, are only going to cover maybe, if you are being optimistic, Mr. Speaker, on the receipts, 50 percent of the new spending.

Yesterday, I think it is Penn Wharton that put out their model, I guess last week, that the capital gains tax itself loses \$33 billion over the first 10 years. So, it is not scored to 15 years; it is 10.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you do what is called the basis, which is how much is subject to the capital gains tax even though the perversity of it is that a huge portion of that is actually inflation we are going to tax, it would raise, in their model, \$133 billion. The administration, the Democrats, have said this will be 330. So, they are only hitting about one-third of the revenues that have been promised from the capital gains tax.

I really want to help the Democrats keep their promise that their new \$4 trillion proposed spending will be covered by their new receipts, their new revenues. They have a really interesting math problem. Either they are going to have to cut their spending substantially in half or dramatically raise taxes on the American people.

We asked Secretary Yellen: Should we expect a value-added tax? Is a VAT in our future?

The math is really ugly—we are going to talk about that in a second here—to cover all these new spending initiatives plus just the demographic curve that is already about to crush us, debtwise.

The answer was an interesting one. It is: Well, that is not part of our current proposal.

For everyone who is interested in tax policy—and I accept that maybe some of us are a little bit on the geek side—I am fascinated with the tax on Medicare financing. Keep an ear out because the only way I think the left is going to get these types of revenues is to actually go to completely new revenue-raising, new tax regimes.

Let's talk about what I consider is the greatest fragility of our Nation's future. It turns out it is not Republican or Democrat policy. It is demographics.

What is the fastest growing demographic in the United States? It is getting old. We are graying very, very fast. It is baby boomers.

When you look at this chart—and we did this last night, but we did it sort of caffeinated, very fast—take the next 30 years. This is without all the new spending that has been proposed this year by the new administration. This is our baseline, \$101 trillion of debt in 30 years at today's dollars. This is inflation-adjusted dollars, 67 percent.

Functionally, \$68 trillion of debt is just Medicare. Only about \$3 trillion is the rest of government, so it is Medicare, then Social Security.

If you believe, Mr. Speaker, like I do, that we have an absolute moral obligation to keep our promises to those folks who have paid into Social Security and Medicare, then what are we going to do to keep that promise?

The reality of it is that this is what buries us as a country. It is our demographics and the promises that are dramatically unfunded. Remember, Mr. Speaker, it is only maybe 4 years or so that the Medicare trust fund—which is only part A, which is the hospital portion—that trust fund is gone.

Part B is actually seeing a doctor. Part C is managed care. That has its own little, in some ways, financial benefits. And D is drugs. Parts B and D are 100 percent out of the general fund. They don't have trust funds.

This is absolutely critical. This will drive all government policy. If you are someone who wants money for education, if you are someone who wants money for the environment or our military, then the fact of the matter is it is Medicare that consumes us.

One of my great frustrations is when you look at the math of how much is spending, Mr. Speaker, and then the financing of that spending, you get a sense that, as Republicans, we have this bad habit. We will go and say: Well, we will balance the budget through waste and fraud.

Democrats will go and say: Well, we are going to balance it by nationalizing healthcare, Medicare for All.

None of those are real. We are not telling the truth.

Let's walk through just a couple of things that are in my craw right now. This is just one portion of the left's bill called H.R. 3. From a conceptual standpoint, it is an honest debate of what are we going to do about prescription drug costs.

The methodology, though, Mr. Speaker, if you actually read the research, in a decade, it is killing people and costing more because we are on the cusp of a time of miracles.

This is really important to get our heads around. We have all heard about this concept of mRNA. We have talked about it for 20-plus years. Years ago, I used to come to this mike and talk about this concept of bio-foundry.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, we can take a snippet of your DNA and a snippet of your cancer, your disease, or your virus, and it would take weeks. And for the CAR-T therapy for cancer, it was \$350,000 just to get you your shot, but it was curing people. We just moved up 10 years in technology.

That is one of the amazing things Operation Warp Speed. It is actually one of the few positive things I can say that came out of this pandemic is it is here.

Look up Tesla and mRNA, Mr. Speaker. You find out that all sorts of very disruptive companies are investing in these little bio-foundries.

We are on the edge of curing HIV, sickle cell anemia. We now have a cure for hemophilia. And we are also going to cure all sorts of cancers. There are some amazing things happening. The problem is they are expensive, Mr. Speaker. But they cure you.

H.R. 3 does something that I think is fairly dark and fairly sinister, and we need our brothers and sisters on the Democrat side to be honest with constituents, and that is something called reference pricing. If a quality year is bought through a drug, but it costs more than, in this case, \$37,000 in Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, you don't get it.

H.R. 3 does this where they take a basket of some of these countries and say that we are going to use their cap. So, you are prepared to turn to your constituent and say: Oh, that drug is \$40,000. Yes, it gives you that quality year, but it is over our cap, so we are not going to provide you that pharmaceutical.

By doing that, we just destroyed small, disruptive bio-foundry pharma that is curing people. We are going to subject our population to say that the misery you have today is the misery

you are going to have tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, because we are going to shut down the disruption. We are going to protect—here is the sinister thing that healthcare economists talk about. The Democrats' H.R. 3 actually protects Big Pharma because the industry now becomes you just adjust your current patent, and that is how you make a living, Mr. Speaker.

But the ones that nip their heels that cure things, it is like the hepatitis C we cure now. Those cures don't come because we have just wiped out the income stream.

We need to rethink. If Republicans and Democrats have a common goal that we need to look at pharmaceutical costs, then destroying the pipeline that cures people and that ends the misery is really dark.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans have our sins. How many of us will get behind a microphone and talk about price transparency? Price transparency is a really good thing, but it has almost no real effect on the price of healthcare. The best academic studies we have been able to find in our office is 0.1 to 0.7 percent.

My point is really simple here. The ACA, ObamaCare, was a financing bill. It was who got subsidized and who had to pay. Our Republican alternative was a financing bill. It was who had to pay and who got subsidized. Medicare for All is a financing bill.

When are we going to have the really tougher discussion of what we pay? Let's disrupt the price of healthcare through technology.

How many of us went to Blockbuster Video last weekend? We don't because now we hit a button called Netflix and all sorts of other things. We allow disruption to happen in other parts of our healthcare, but we have built so many regulatory barriers and so many licensing barriers, crazy things that would disrupt healthcare.

One of my grand proposals—and this one needs to be Republicans and Democrats coming together—that \$68 trillion over the next 30 years in just Medicare spending, that is a substantial driver for U.S. sovereign debt. Thirty-one percent of it is just diabetes.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, if you and I can have a revolution in ending the misery of diabetes, it is also the single biggest initiative you can have to U.S. sovereign debt.

It is time Republicans and Democrats come together and do an Operation Warp Speed on diabetes. Yes, there is really neat research that is on the cusp of almost curatives for type 1, the autoimmune pancreatic cells. But the political side is going to be really tough for all of us because we are going to have to talk about type 2, which has a substantial lifestyle component in it. It needs a discussion of what we do in nutrition support as a country and what we do in our farm bill as a country.

Mr. Speaker, if we care about people, if we really are going to come here and

give speeches about how minority communities and my Native American communities from Arizona had such horrible outcomes during COVID, are you willing to look at the comorbidities that were there before COVID? It is diabetes.

□ 1230

And it turns out, spending money on this management curative—and I really want curative—turns out to be one of the most powerful things you and I could ever do for U.S. sovereign debt going forward. It is 31 percent of just Medicare spending, and the numbers we are still working on for Medicaid and other things.

So part of my other proposal is there are things we could do almost overnight that have incredible impacts on the cost of healthcare in this country; and here is one that I beg of us to start getting in our lexicon.

Sixteen percent of the healthcare spending this year, over half a trillion dollars, just this year, will be people not taking their meds or taking them incorrectly. You have hypertension, you don't take your meds, you have a stroke. You have high cholesterol, you don't take your meds—and those things are cheap and inexpensive. Grandma is forgetful, or we get busy in our lives.

And it turns out there are things where the pill top talks to your phone. It talks to you. There are other ones where it dispenses the pharmaceuticals to you.

It turns out the technology of getting people to take their pharmaceuticals properly, if we would understand its impact, that is 16 percent of U.S. healthcare spending is just not taking our pharmaceuticals properly. That is a half a trillion dollars.

Think about what you could do with a half a trillion dollars a year—not over 10, not over 15; a year—and how much less misery you would have in this country by people having strokes, getting sick.

This is not a revolution of trying to crush pharma or go after drug prices. It is actually taking a look and using this crazy thing we call, oh, yeah, math, and a calculator, and also technology.

And, yes, it doesn't work necessarily in our political lexicon. It is a little harder to campaign on, but it happens to be factual.

The other thing I am going to beg of us—and Congressman GOHMERT, I appreciate him yielding to me. So I promise I will only do one or two more boards.

I need us to think revolutionary. Before the pandemic, a Democratic colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, from California, a good guy, has worked with me on telemedicine. It was a piece of legislation that substantially was going to go nowhere because there were lots and lots and lots and lots of lobbyists who hated it because it disrupts the money.

But when the pandemic hit, our telemedicine bill became law. It expires

when they declare the pandemic over. The expansion of reimbursement and access to telemedicine goes away. We need to fix that.

But we also now need to understand what is telemedicine. Telemedicine is the thing you can wear on your wrist; the thing you can wear on your chest; the thing you blow into.

The technology is here to crash the price of healthcare. And all the skeptics who attacked telemedicine before the pandemic, oh Grandma's not going to be able to use; they don't know how to work FaceTime; no one is going to want to make a phone call to a doctor or a healthcare professional.

Turns out they were wrong. We have the last 18 months of proof. The satisfaction rates are off the chart. A, we need to continue it, but we need to expand the definition.

And then the other things the pandemic has brought us is things we never thought of.

How about a little home kit?

These are available today. Actually, you can get them sent to your house in a day. Blow into it. It tells you if you have COVID-19.

Well, if that exists for COVID, what would happen if I turned to you and said, turns out we have the technology today where you can have a medical lab in your medicine cabinet. You blow into it, it tells you if you even have cancer cells or a virus or bacteria. It exists today.

We, as a body, need to legalize the disruptive technologies that allow us to disrupt the price of healthcare if we are going to save Medicare, save the country from the crushing debt. And, yes, we are going to annoy a lot of incumbent investors and a lot of incumbent businesses, but it is the right and moral thing to do.

We have a society that has become a country of oligopolies, and Congress has become a protection racket. We protect incumbents; not incumbent elected officials, incumbent business models.

Yet the disruption of the technology that is here today crushes the misery of so many of our brothers and sisters out there who have chronic conditions, that get sick.

We can crash the price of healthcare. We can make us healthier as a society. We can take on, in that same breath, the crushing debt that is here. And it is demographic. It is coming. No matter how many speeches we give pretending we have a way around it, the only way around it is we have got to change the actual price of healthcare.

I beg of us, we need to think differently because this place, often our policy sets, sort of sounds like it is still the 1990s.

Mr. GOHMERT. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, I would love to yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. SCHWEIKERT's ongoing analyses of the way we mismanage money

around Washington, D.C. And I was reading about proposals to go after the billionaires, the mega-rich, and I recall what Ronald Reagan's economist, economic adviser, Arthur Laffer, had said. Dr. Laffer said—he told a small group of us years ago—if you want to produce money—of course, I am asking you this because I have such great respect for your monetary analyses.

If you want to go after money, you want to produce tax revenue, the one place you will never get it is going after the super-rich because they are the only people in America who have the wherewithal to avoid whatever tax you put on them.

What is your thought about that analysis?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I have actually been blessed to spend lots of time with Professor Laffer and, actually, a couple of other folks who also have Nobel Prizes in economics. They tolerate me.

Gilder, I consider a personal friend, if you really want to geek out.

First off, you have a conceptual problem and the left doesn't—we have got to work with them to first admit we tax income. Property taxes are really the only things we tax wealth. We tax your real estate wealth.

So the leaked IRS data, which is a real problem if you want confidence in a tax system that, once again, the IRS is back to being weaponized. If you want to tax wealth, that is a different tax system, and there are all sorts of games you can play with that.

You could take your wealth and say, all right, here is what I am going to do. I am not going to take an income. I am going to borrow from it.

So how do you tax it?

You have to conceptualize very, very different.

We also—we actually have the math, even though it may not happen in the fiscal year you want it to. The ultrawealthy give away most of their wealth. That has been a tradition in this country, particularly for about a century and a half.

A tax system to work—and the gentleman and I have actually had a side conversation about this. You have to find what is the most—or the least disruptive tax that maximizes revenue, but also maximizes economic expansion. So we are already seeing some data that the Democrats' proposal on capital gains tax, actually, without changing the basis, actually raises substantially less revenues.

Now how is that possible?

It is because you stop engaging in those economic activities.

So somewhere there is a sweet spot that maximizes revenues, but also then maximizes economic activity. And I have an absolute fixation that 2018, 2019 were miracle years economically for the working poor in this country. It is 2 years where, actually, income inequality genuinely shrank; the broad based nature of the working poor getting dramatically less poor.

That shouldn't be a partisan fight. It should be the bipartisan goal.

And the rich got richer, but not as fast as the poor got less poor. And that is back to, in a weird way, a long answer to your question.

We need to have an honest debate of what maximizes revenues while minimizing economic damage. And right now, just throwing out numbers, and then throwing out fake—and I am being a little brutal on that—fake models from the administration saying we are going to raise \$4 trillion, we are going to cover all of our new spending, when all of the other models—and very soon joint tax will score it and we will see what the reality is.

But everyone it is scoring right now, the Dems are only getting about half the revenues. And we have already seen the first analysis of the corporate tax hike. It unemploys 1 million Americans in the first 24 months.

Mr. GOHMERT. That would be people who would pay income tax if they didn't lose their jobs.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. That didn't lose their jobs. And the harder part of the scoring is—and this was one of the miracles of 2018 and 2019—the Democrats repeatedly attacked the tax reforms from the end of 2017 and the regulatory reforms.

But there were so many people working, and there was such vitality in the economy that Medicare part A, the trust fund, grew in years. Social Security grew in years because there were so many people paying their payroll tax.

They didn't really pay income tax because they were part of the population that had been removed from having to pay income tax because we changed—but it turns out, if you actually, truly believe we have a societal obligation to keep our promises, to keep Social Security, to keep Medicare vibrant, it turns out you need an incredibly vibrant economy for people to be working. You can do that also by a rational tax policy instead of a punishing one.

Mr. GOHMERT. I know you would have—

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I am sorry; it is a long answer, but it actually has—

Mr. GOHMERT. No, no. I appreciate my friend from Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT's excellent analysis, because we do want to have a vibrant economy. As the saying goes, it lifts all boats. And I really appreciate the analysis on where the Medicare spending is going. That is something we need to deal with.

I hear solutions of throwing money at the problem, but the real problem is we don't have the proper money to throw at it because the economy is not doing as it should.

And then I still hear our friends talk about the need to stop climate change. Unfortunately, the climate has been changing since the Earth ever appeared. And I have got a lot of friends out there. And I say friends facetiously. People on the left—I am beginning to understand that sarcasm is a tool that is appreciated by the intelligent. So the left, the alt-left, they don't get it.

But this is an article from Ethan Hunt back in August of 2019. It says: NASA admits that climate change occurs because of changes in Earth's solar orbit; not because of SUVs and fossil fuel.

Well, it really can be a combination of things. But having found out from the former NASA Director that the Moon's orbit is slightly changing and the Earth's orbit is slightly changing and, as the term was, it is becoming more squashed, well, that would mean there are times when we are closer to the Sun and we are further away from the Sun.

And I know there are some leftists at NASA that said: Oh, no, changing Earth's orbit doesn't affect our climate at all.

And I would humbly submit that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand that if you get closer to the Sun, or if you get further away from the Sun, it is absolutely going to affect your climate; just as more solar activity, more solar flares, they are going to affect our climate. And there is not a lot that we can do about more solar flares, solar activities, solar hot spots.

And I would sarcastically ask a question regarding the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service, since they were going to be spending so much time on climate change, and we had heard the Earth's orbit was changing slightly and the Moon's orbit was changing slightly.

Could they do anything about that?

□ 1245

For those who thought I was really challenging BLM, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest Service, like they were going to do something about the Earth's orbit, the National Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, they are not going to do anything about the Earth's orbit because they can't. That is not their job.

Although there is some professor that thinks we might could adjust our orbit, I think that is still yet to be arrived at scientifically. It is an interesting concept, but I had no belief that it was about to happen by the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service.

It is interesting to look back. I missed this article back in 2019. It goes into much more detail about not only the changing orbit but the changing tilt from time to time.

Then if you do more digging, you find out that actually, going back millions—some say 56 million; some say billions—that the planet was much hotter, and the planet's orbit was closer to the Sun. It has moved back some, according to some, over the millions or billions, whatever you believe, number of years.

I also want to mention this article from The Washington Times, June 16, 2021, Stephen Dinan, about "Smartphone smugglers: How social media is reshaping border crime." It is

really intriguing. The author does an amazing job of pulling these things together.

It is interesting. The drug cartels south of our border, apparently, we are informed, have workers in every city in America. Of course, we have heard before that the Border Patrol, ICE, the U.S. Government is considered to be the logistics for the multibillion-dollar drug cartels in Mexico because the drug cartels get them across illegally into the United States. And I have seen people in the middle of the night, as they are being processed by the Border Patrol, long lines of people. I have watched them comparing addresses and sometimes switching addresses.

They are the addresses that the drug cartels have given them as to where the drug cartels want them to go work in order to earn enough money, either drug trafficking, sex trafficking, or human trafficking, to pay off the rest of their debt to the drug cartels for getting them into the United States illegally. Many times, it is the U.S. Government, which means U.S. taxpayers, that end up paying to send the drug cartels' employees, or indentured servants, to the cities where the drug cartels want them.

It is incredible that we, as a U.S. Government, are helping the drug cartels in Mexico make the tens of billions of dollars that they use to keep different levels of government corrupt in Mexico, that keep the Mexican people from having the economy that would allow them to have across-the-board wonderful homes, have wonderful jobs, and be one of the top economies in the world. The corruption of the drug cartels keeps Mexico from having their true place in the top economies in the world.

They have some of the hardest-working people in the world. They have incredible natural resources, a fantastic location—actually, better than the U.S. because they are between North and South America, and they are between the Pacific and the Atlantic. Incredible location, hardworking people, great natural resources, good ports, but the corruption that the American people are funding through their U.S. Government and through the purchase of drugs that are massively coming into this country—if somebody truly has compassion for the people of Mexico and Central America, they would demand that our southern border be secured, that we continue to provide visas in greater numbers than any country in the world, but we secure the border so that we cut the tens of billions of dollars from flowing to the drug cartels that then corrupt and destroy lives, kill Americans with fentanyl and other drugs that are pouring into our country. And the Mexican people would come to the United States on vacation to spend the significant, wonderful money they had earned without fear of the drug cartels and what they will do to them if they are not subservient.

There was a time in Mexico when people who were wealthy knew the drug cartels would normally leave them alone. There was a time in Mexico when the drug cartels basically had a wink-and-nod agreement: Look, we won't have attacks in tourist attractions because we know how important that money is.

Well, all of those days are gone. If we were really a compassionate neighbor, we would secure our border. We would stop drawing off people with the potential to be the best citizens that Guatemala, Mexico, other countries have, drawing them up here because of the corruption below our border that we in the U.S. Government are helping fund.

It really needs to stop. But it is getting worse, much, much worse, as we are seeing numbers that no one has seen in many, many years.

There has been so much appropriate concern about January 6 and what happened that day. Unfortunately, we don't know all that happened that day. There are some major questions that need to be answered.

We know that the former chief of the Capitol Police testified that they got no intelligence from the FBI about potential violence on January 6. There were lots of stories about people who were here at the Capitol on January 6 that may have carried a Confederate flag, may have had red on and MAGA or Trump.

But the Capitol Police had told me the day before: Hey, we have heard there are going to be people who hate Trump that are going to be trying to blend in, and there is going to be violence, and we are concerned about it.

But the chief of the Capitol Police said they got no intel like that from the FBI.

An article a few days ago from Revolver says: "Unindicted Co-Conspirators in the January 6 Cases Raise Disturbing Questions of Federal Foreknowledge." That is June 14. I saw my friend Tucker Carlson covered this last night.

But this is really disturbing, and this is something that I know from my time here in Congress has disturbed Democrats and Republicans alike across the aisle because we don't like to see government agents stirring up trouble or find that there are criminal acts that would not likely have occurred had not the Federal Government been participating, whether they were actual agents or undercover agents or informants that were working for the Federal Government.

But this is scary stuff. This is kind of third-world stuff. This is not only third-world stuff, but this is like Putin kind of activity.

If there were Federal agents that were involved on January 6, we really need to know what the FBI knew and when they knew it. Not only that, we need to know how much participation did any of our Federal friends, either at DOJ, FBI, or any of the intel community, what kind of role were they playing.

There is information that came out about the effort to kidnap the Michigan Governor, and it has been said that there were Federal agents that were involved in that. It would seem, if you have 14 people that are involved in a conspiracy to commit a crime, and over a third of them, including people in leadership, are Federal agents, undercover agents, or people that are working for a Federal entity, that we have got some serious problems, and we have not done adequate oversight.

It disturbs me greatly that there was not more information forthcoming from our Federal law enforcement intelligence, DOJ, than was received here on Capitol Hill because, surely, if they had known the level of planning by a small group to actually commit violence and break into our U.S. Capitol, they would have been better prepared.

I know some of us have had extreme differences with the Speaker, but I just feel sure if she had known the level of violence that was being talked about and planned and monitored by DOJ and FBI, surely she would not have allowed the Sergeant at Arms to turn down National Guard support on January 6.

This article pulls from documents, legal documents, that have been filed by the Federal Government in some of these different cases. This article says: "To address the matter directly in the following three questions: In the year leading up to January 6 and during January 6 itself, to what extent were the three primary militia groups—the Oath Keepers, the Proud Boys, and the Three Percenters—that the FBI, DOJ, Pentagon, and network news have labeled most responsible for planning and executing a Capitol attack on January 6 infiltrated by agencies of the Federal Government, or informants of said agencies?"

Question 2: "Exactly how many Federal undercover agents or confidential informants were present at the Capitol or in the Capitol during the infamous 'siege,' and what roles did they play—merely passive informants or active instigators?"

And, third: "Finally, of all of the unindicted co-conspirators referenced in the charging documents," the official Federal pleadings, "of those indicted for crimes on January 6, how many worked as a confidential informant or as an undercover operative for the Federal Government—FBI, Army Counterintelligence, et cetera?"

□ 1300

"If the narrative about January 6 does not conform to the questions above, the American people will never learn the most important truth about what January 6 is, and what kind of country they're really living in.

"If it turns out the Federal Government did in fact have undercover agents or confidential informants embedded within the so-called militia groups indicted for conspiring to obstruct the Senate certification on January 6, the implications would be nothing

short of seismic. Especially if such agents or informants enjoyed extremely senior-level positions within such groups."

And the thing is, like I said, they have got documentation, the Federal pleadings that the United States Government has filed in some of these cases, that really raised serious issues. Yeah, there is no question, there were radical groups there, and those three seem to be the most prominent. But from the pleadings from the Department of Justice itself, it appears that they had significant presence and participation in what went on.

We do need to see the 14,000 hours of security video, seeing Ashli Babbitt killed by an officer standing off to the side. There were officers in front of the window, but then there were officers on the other side where Ashli was; and it appeared it was John Sullivan, a Trump hater, that told them if they will move out of the way they won't get hurt, and the officers appeared. Well, they moved out of the way, and these guys broke through the glass.

And yet with all of the people that the FBI has sought information on and put up pictures—and it appears they were probably wearing masks, but there is another 14,000 hours of video. These guys were around in the Capitol, around the Capitol. They didn't have their masks up at all times. But it doesn't appear that the FBI has asked for assistance in identifying those people that broke through the glass or that were right there, at least when Ashli was shot in the neck and killed.

And that normally means if they are not asking for help in identifying somebody that they know who they are—and maybe they are person 1, person 2, person 3, person 15—that are referred to in the pleadings of people that were working with the FBI or Federal authorities of some kind.

But this is very unsettling stuff. It was bad enough to have our Capitol attacked. As a former felony judge, I would have no problem sending people to prison that broke into this Capitol, that literally broke in or that did damage or that stole things here. There is no place for that, and they do need to be severely punished.

But were some of those people doing those things working for the FBI? Were they egged on by Federal authorities? Because it sure looks like from some of these legal documents they filed and the masking of names and referring to them as something other than their real names that we have a serious problem with some of the people that were involved that day that it appears were either working for Federal authorities or were informants for Federal authorities and had leadership positions in those groups and quite possibly, in some cases probably, helped to egg them on.

This article says in many cases the unindicted co-conspirators appear to be much more aggressive and egregious participants in the very so-called con-

spiracy, serving as the basis for charging those indicted. The question immediately arises as to why this is the case and forces us to consider whether certain individuals are being protected from indictment because they were involved in January 6 as undercover operatives or confidential informants for a Federal agency.

So another place further on in the article it points out: "This would be far worse than the already bad situation of the government knowing about the possibility of violence and doing nothing. Instead, this would imply that elements of the federal government were active instigators in the most egregious and spectacular aspects of January 6, amounting to a monumental entrapment scheme used as a pretext to imprison otherwise harmless protesters at the Capitol—and in a much larger sense used to frame the entire MAGA movement as potential domestic terrorists."

There is so much more. Let's see, further on, I guess this is page 8/26. "In one of the plot's climactic scenes, in the main van driving up to look at Governor Whitmer's vacation home"—and that is of course the plot to kidnap the Governor—"three out of the five people in the van—60 percent of the plot's senior leaders—were Federal agents and informants."

"FBI infiltrators comprised, at the very least"—talking about overall in that plot—"26 percent of the plotters. That is, at least five FBI operatives have been disclosed, against just 14 suspects indicted."

So looking at some of the pleadings by the DOJ themselves, but just to give an idea of what we are dealing with, it says, "On December 30, 2020, Watkins and Caldwell exchanged the following text messages:

"Watkins: Looks like we are green light to come to D.C. on the 6th. The rally point still at your place?"

"Caldwell: Not that I am aware. Have been contacted by no one. Typical (Person one). Here's the rub: (Person two) and I will be in a hotel within striking distance of the city starting on the 4th, so we won't even be here. There will be some stuff going on during the 5th, and we want to be a part of that whenever it shakes out."

Person one and person two were apparently working for the Federal authorities, some Federal agency.

Another place it references person two, person three, person one, and they seem to be significant leaders in what is going on.

Another place: Person three—emailed person three several maps along with the message. These maps will get you from the hotel into D.C.

I mean, person 10 checked into the Hilton Garden Inn in Vienna.

Person three, another reference.

Person 15 and person 20 are referenced.

These are people that they are covering up their names because they are working for the Federal authorities.

If you look at some of the video on January 6, there were a lot of people walking around. They had no business being in the Capitol. But it is quite concerning that people that were extremely active at all should have been or were working for Federal entities such that they have to cover up their names because of their complicity with the Federal authorities during that day.

So that is United States versus Caldwell, Crowl, and then there is one Government's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration of Detention.

They are holding some of these people still. Some with 23 hours, 24 hours a day in solitary. Some were just walking around, they did no damage. They should not have come into the Capitol, but it remains to be seen why the government has their stinger out so much for people no matter how mild their participation on January 6.

And yet the biggest damage done to the United States in protests was last summer, and those folks aren't being treated the same way that others are.

So there are some very serious questions that need to be answered. We do need the answers. We need to know how many Federal agents; how many informants had given information to Federal agencies and why in the world all of that information was not provided to people that needed to protect Capitol Hill.

So we need an investigation. We don't need one that has an entire Democrat staff. It needs to be truly bipartisan to get to the bottom of just what happened that day and who caused it to happen.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

SERVICE BEFORE SELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

(Ms. SLOTKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about service by recognizing individuals and organizations who have stepped up when their fellow citizens needed them most. Through their actions, they have shown what it means to put others before self.

DR. SATURNINO RODRIGUEZ

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I begin by rising today to honor Dr. Saturnino Rodriguez, a good friend and devoted servant of the Latino community in Lansing.

Over the years, Dr. Rodriguez, or Nino as he is known around town, has had many titles. In each role, he has left a profound impact on the students, faculty, parents, and community residents that call greater Lansing home.

Dr. Rodriguez has spent his entire professional life working in schools—

first in Peru, then in Grand Rapids, and then Lansing, where he has worked tirelessly for the past 50 years to improve the lives of children through education. His career has taken him from being a counselor at C.W. Otto Junior High, an assistant principal at Gardner Junior High and Eastern High School, principal at Pattengill Middle School, and finally as deputy superintendent of the entire school district.

He was an innovator in the classroom, developing a clustered teaching approach that is still being used today. In addition, he led the adoption of guidelines proposed by the Youth Violence Prevention Coalition, which brought about significant positive changes in student and community relations.

Since 2009, he has been an elected member of the Lansing District Board of Education, a role that he carries out with joy because it allows him to continue his service to Lansing students.

Dr. Rodriguez' passions extend beyond education. He is an officer with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and a member of the Ingham County Health Department's Board of Health. But to really know Dr. Rodriguez, you only need to read his monthly magazine *Adelante Forward*.

Published in both English and Spanish, *Adelante Forward* has been an instrumental source of information for the Lansing community, advertising new businesses and spreading word about resources from Head Start classes to COVID vaccine clinics. It has been a key way to reach Latino and Hispanic residents, bridging the language gap in order to improve community relations. And, as I am sure Dr. Rodriguez is proud to know, it is even being used by some Spanish language teachers as part of their lesson plans.

The publication wouldn't be possible without the special partners that work to put it together: Danny Layne, Allena Tapia, Patricia Briones, and Dr. George Mansour. In addition, no tribute to Dr. Rodriguez would be complete without mention of his wife of 30 years, Margarita, as well as their two daughters and two grandchildren.

It is my privilege to represent Dr. Rodriguez in Washington. I am grateful for his willingness to always speak to me about Lansing's needs. Every time we are able to connect, it is a pleasure to hear about the good work being done to improve the lives of others. I am appreciative of his commitment to serving others, and it is my honor to recognize him today in the permanent RECORD of the people's House.

□ 1315

HONORING LISA BRINKER

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Lisa Brinker, a resident of Lake Orion, who has been there for her community when it needed her most.

Ms. Brinker has faced adversity in her life. Three years ago, her husband passed away from brain cancer. Out of

that pain, she found purpose. Over the course of the last year, she has devoted her time to the New Day Foundation for Families, a local nonprofit that supports those fighting cancer and their loved ones.

The financial cost of a cancer diagnosis goes beyond just medical care, as I know well. Beyond the loss of income, the increase in expenses, and emotional distress, it is a diagnosis that can consume us entirely. And that is where the New Day Foundation for Families comes in. With an army of local volunteers like Ms. Brinker, they provide resources to give cancer patients hope through financial assistance and emotional support.

When her husband was in the hospital, Ms. Brinker was surrounded by family, friends, and churchgoers who helped lighten the load. For her, she wouldn't have known what to do without that help. And it is why she works so hard to make someone else's load a little lighter. During the pandemic, when family members of immunocompromised patients saw a trip to the grocery store as a fraught experience, Ms. Brinker was there to provide for their essential needs.

Since the program began last spring, volunteers like Lisa made more than 300 deliveries helping 125 families in total. They were a godsend during COVID, and not just for their food deliveries. By demonstrating that service doesn't stop, not even during a once-in-a-generation pandemic, Ms. Brinker was a source of inspiration and strength. With an infectious attitude that brightens the days of all she serves, we are lucky to have her in our community.

Ms. Brinker has persevered through adversity and loss, and it has magnified her service. With the powerful perspective that comes with experience, she has used it to better her Lake Orion community. As a humble spirit, she prefers that any recognition focus on making a difference. An article in the local paper ended with her asking readers to get themselves involved. And true to form, for this recognition, she indicated that credit should go to the good people of the New Day Foundation for Families.

It is a rare soul who can reduce pain and hardship in others, especially when they themselves have been in that position. For her work to honor the loving memory of her husband and her tireless service to community, it is my privilege to recognize Lisa Brinker on the House floor today.

HONORING LISA KOCAB

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize another Lisa, the ultimate champion and advocate for the disability community in Brighton, Michigan, Ms. Lisa Kocab.

Put simply, Lisa is a powerhouse. As a teacher and a mother of five, including an incredible 10-year-old boy, PJ, who has Down syndrome, she has built and created an incredible circle of support since moving back to Michigan in 2016.

At first, when she was scouting schools for PJ, she had to push through being told “no.” The family wanted to move back to be nearer to the kids’ grandparents, but the first school district that they called referred to students with special needs as “those kids.” Other schools gave similar responses when asked if PJ could be placed in general education.

That is, until she called Brighton’s special education director, who told Lisa that PJ could absolutely go to school with the other students; that if they moved to Brighton, she would work with them. So that is what Lisa and her husband did.

Now, Lisa will be the first to tell you that it wasn’t always smooth sailing. She has had to overcome plenty of challenges from PJ’s struggles with development to the hurt of hearing intolerant words and from other families.

Lisa has been tested in too many ways to count, but she has turned her pain into purpose by deciding to open Gigi’s Playhouse in Southfield, Michigan. With more than 45 locations nationwide, Gigi’s Playhouses are now “achievement centers” for individuals with Down syndrome. They are spaces that are specifically designed for kids to interact and play with each other while offering free programs to learn how to read, improve their health, develop career skills, and reach their greatest potential.

Lisa was the driving force behind fundraising, searching for a location, and pulling resources together. Now, with her dream a reality, she strives every day to realize the vision of Gigi’s Playhouses, to see a world where individuals with Down syndrome are accepted and embraced in their families, schools, and communities.

In its first year of operation, Gigi’s served 383 people with Down syndrome, more than half of whom were adults. Since then, they have expanded their offerings and, in order to help more residents, even adapting during the pandemic by switching to virtual programs.

Mr. Speaker, I am a firm believer in finding your people, those who will have your back and stay by your side through ups and downs, failures and successes. Without a doubt, Lisa Kocab has found her people in Brighton and at Gigi’s Playhouse; and the disability community in Michigan has found its person in Lisa.

She is an inspiration to us all, and I am so proud to represent her here in the Halls of Congress. It is my honor to speak these words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that her story can inspire all who read it.

RECOGNIZING THE WONG FAMILY

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a staple of the community, the Wong family of Wong Express House in Brighton.

Before moving to Michigan, Xueqi Wong worked as a fisherman and a security officer for his town while raising his family with his wife, Mei, in Fujian province, China.

They immigrated to the U.S. in 1991, moving to Brighton 10 years later, where they have built a successful business with a loyal following for the last two decades. Mr. Wong, known as Ed around town, is known for his work ethic and attention to detail. His employees rave about the culture he brings to the team. “Extremely flexible and supportive,” “Very welcoming and inspiring,” “I feel honored to work with such excellent people” is some of what they have said.

Mr. Wong’s character truly came through in his devotion to keeping his customers and employees safe during COVID-19. At a time when restaurants and dining establishments were particularly hard hit by the public health restrictions, Mr. Wong put a plan in place to allow Wong Express House to stay afloat.

After closing for 9 weeks, they reopened on May 29, 2020, as a model for safe service. With a separate enclosed area inside the restaurant, the dining area was transformed into a contactless pickup window for customer convenience. Instead of dine-in, the restaurant trained staff to fully transition into drive-thru and carry-out only.

The changes were not easy, but the space was turned into a safe, simple, and effective process that limited customer-to-staff interaction, keeping everyone safe from infection. That ability to adapt, to work through the challenges in order to keep customers satisfied, is why I am proud to recognize Mr. Wong; his wife, Mei; their son, Jian on the floor of the House today.

Their pride in their restaurant is evident as soon as you walk in the door, and their resilience can be found in their dedication to each other and our community. During the shutdown, when Jian had to travel back to Brooklyn to support his wife and two kids, Mr. and Mrs. Wong stayed in Brighton holding down the fort to make sure that their staff would be taken care of.

It is no surprise that on their first day back in business they were so overwhelmed with support to the point that they completely sold out of food. Now, as they chart a course for the weeks and months ahead, I know that the Wong family will continue to demonstrate the toughness and grit that Michiganders are known for during uncertain times.

On behalf of a grateful community, it is my honor to recognize the leadership and staff at Wong Express House by inserting their story of resilience into the permanent RECORD so that it may last for years to come.

RECOGNIZING PECKHAM, INCORPORATED

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an organization in my district that goes above and beyond by providing job training opportunities for folks with significant disabilities and other barriers to employment.

A nonprofit based in Lansing, Peckham, Incorporated, provides a platform for people to demonstrate

their unique abilities by learning new skills and enjoying the rewards of an honest day’s work. From career planning to vocational training, to employer services, Peckham offers more than 30 different programs that create opportunities for every single individual they work with.

Named after the former rehabilitation services director of the State of Michigan, Ralf Peckham, they began serving the greater Lansing region in 1976. Today, they have grown into one of the largest community rehabilitation programs in the entire State.

With core values of compassion, community, and collaboration as a foundation, Peckham has broken the mold of what a human services agency can be. They go beyond just matching skills to places of employment. They treat each person, no matter their ability, with respect and dignity. Their holistic approach to each situation allows them to build an environment of trust, where each person they work with can thrive.

A physical, cognitive, behavioral, or socioeconomic challenge should never get in the way of someone realizing their full potential. To that end, Peckham makes our district and our State a better place to live. At a fundamental level, they help folks to earn economic and personal independence by creating, sustaining, and improving employment opportunities in our community.

Peckham is a leader of workplace culture, from how employers view mental health to how to safely reopen as we see a light at the end of the tunnel in COVID-19. For their efforts, they have been featured in Fortune Magazine’s Great Places to Work List, and recognized by the U.S. Department of Labor with the Gold Hire Vets Medalion Award.

Mr. Speaker, accessibility and diversity are cornerstones of a modern workplace. They make our economy stronger, bring our communities closer, and demonstrate what our country is all about: Equality of opportunity.

Today, I am proud to congratulate Peckham on 45 successful years harnessing the power of acceptance. They develop potential, work with purpose, and deliver results. With these remarks on the House floor, may their contributions to our Nation live on in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECOGNIZING LIVINGSTON COUNTY MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, in Livingston County, there is a group of retired medical professionals and volunteers that answer the call to serve by staying in action and continuing to train in the event of emergencies.

In 2006, the Livingston County Medical Reserve Corps was founded as a public health volunteer team. Today, I am proud to honor them on the House floor during their work during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As one of the 762 Medical Reserve Corps units in the Nation, they are

part of a network of locally organized groups that strive to improve the health and safety of our communities.

In Livingston County, our reserve corps is composed of 194 members, with an extra 80 volunteers, dedicating their time at the clinic. These folks are registered nurses, pharmacists, physician's assistants, nurse practitioners, paramedics, licensed professional nurses, EMTs, firefighters, veterinarians, chiropractors, social workers, teachers, public health professionals, and others with nonmedical backgrounds.

They come from all walks of life, but they are motivated to their cause, which is a healthier Livingston County. And their work during the pandemic is nothing short of heroic. They helped with mask packaging and distribution, staffing a COVID hotline, contact tracing, and vaccine support. Without the reserve corps, the county would not have been able to respond as effectively.

Since the beginning of last year, temporary staff have logged almost 7,000 hours on duty, with volunteers adding another 5,000 hours. These hours represent shots in arms, questions answered, fears put at ease, and more.

When our people need it the most, the Medical Reserve Corps stepped up. Their training designed for full-scale emergencies meant the difference when Livingston County was tested like never before.

I am so grateful for each and every member who has proudly worn the yellow vest of the Medical Reserve Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to recognize Jennifer Kramer, the Medical Reserve Corps coordinator, who has certainly personally put in incredibly long hours in service to others.

With their motto of Partner, Provide, Prepare, and Protect, the Medical Reserve Corps makes the extraordinary seem ordinary. I have seen them in action myself when I visited a vaccination clinic in January. They are organized, efficient, and wholly devoted to the cause.

It is my great honor to speak these words into the official RECORD so that future generations can read about these heroes who were there when we needed them most.

RECOGNIZING CRISTO REY COMMUNITY CENTER

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cristo Rey Community Center, a nonprofit organization that has been meeting the needs of the Lansing community since 1968.

As a comprehensive, basic-needs service center, Cristo Rey is an invaluable source for residents, no matter their station in life. The center's health clinic serves the uninsured and underinsured while offering counseling to those struggling with substance abuse and addiction. Their financial counselors help folks develop healthy spending and saving habits, and their community kitchen serves free hot breakfast and lunch Monday through Friday.

In 2018 alone, Cristo Rey served over 56,000 members of their community. They distributed over 357,000 pounds of food, and provided more than 21,000 meals to the hungry. Their family health center cared for nearly 2,800 unique patients, empowered 1,500 individuals to manage their finances, and helped families save over \$700,000 in prescription drug costs.

□ 1330

In addition to these programs, Cristo Rey served as an essential warming center during harsh winters and as a cooling center during sweltering summers for the roughly 5,000 individuals who are homeless in the Lansing area.

Every day, Cristo Rey staff live up to their motto: "Serving individuals, serving families, serving communities. Always with compassion. Always with respect."

Wherever there is a need, whether it is a basic need, a spiritual need, or a societal need, Cristo Rey is there. Yes, they offer support and care, but they also focus on self-sufficiency and honoring the dignity of every person who walks through their doors.

For the poor and vulnerable, immigrants and migrants, and all people in need, regardless of language or culture, Cristo Rey is instrumental in the work to break the cycle of poverty and lift the community up. As a trusted organization, they are crucial to building bridges between different parts of the city.

In 2019, during the search for a new police chief, Cristo Rey hosted the first community meet-and-greet for Daryl Green, who became Lansing's chief of police. When our community was rocked by COVID, Cristo Rey was one of the first to retool its programs and offerings in order to start adapting to changing times.

These days, with a grant from the Dart Foundation, the center has been able to offer vaccinations to residents, particularly in underserved and hard-to-reach communities, which is essential for bringing down the rates of infection and reopening Michigan's economy.

For their 50 years of service to Lansing, it is my great honor to recognize the men and women who truly do God's work at Cristo Rey Community Center. May they continue to live out their mission for the next 50 years and for as long as these words remain in the RECORD of the people's House.

RECOGNIZING LACASA

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize LACASA, a nonprofit in my community that has stood out as a beacon of hope for thousands of vulnerable women and children in mid-Michigan.

In 1979, LACASA was founded as the Livingston Area Council Against Spousal Abuse. With just \$40 in donations and a part-time director at a desk in a borrowed office space, the organization first relied entirely on volunteers, selfless local residents who

opened up their own homes so that survivors of domestic violence could find refuge.

Later on, as it grew, LACASA was able to rent, then buy, and finally expand to a permanent shelter where women and children can access counseling services, legal advocacy, and wraparound support.

In addition to sanctuary, LACASA offers 24-hour crisis response with trained staff who are able to intake and serve the diverse needs of survivors of child abuse, domestic abuse, and sexual assault. For so many in our community, the folks at LACASA are directly responsible for giving them the tools and strength to begin the road toward a better future.

However, pandemics don't stop abusers. In fact, when outside stressors occur, abuse historically tends to escalate. So when shelter-in-place orders took effect last year, closing LACASA and its around-the-clock facility was not an option. Record numbers of victims seeking help and refuge contacted them, and their ability to adapt is nothing short of heroic.

In 2020 alone, LACASA provided 1,170 overnight stays in hotel rooms and over 3,500 off-site meals for victims and their families. They expanded capacity to handle a 230-percent increase in child forensic interviews.

LACASA saw the number of calls to their 24/7 helpline nearly double when the number of individuals seeking personal protection orders more than tripled compared to an average year.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the chance to personally visit LACASA, touring their shelter and working with their president, CEO, and badass, Bobette Schrandt, on several occasions. I am so thankful for her leadership and for the entire organization's tireless support and work to provide a port in the storm for local residents.

They are a model for similar nonprofits, earning national accreditation from the National Children's Alliance as a children's advocacy center just last week. Bobette told me herself. It is their highest level of membership, an honor that says everything about LACASA's dedication to addressing childhood abuse in southeast Michigan.

Today, I am proud to lift up their trauma-informed procedures and practices as a shining beacon of hope in Michigan's Eighth District.

On behalf of a grateful community, thank you for the work that you do, and may you continue to lead the way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 711. An act to amend the West Los Angeles Leasing Act of 2016 to authorize the use of certain funds received pursuant to leases

entered into under such Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title.

S.475.—An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Monday, June 21, 2021.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 21, 2021, at 9 a.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION)

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Melanie A. Stansbury

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1393. A letter from the General Counsel, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting (RIN: 3052-AD47) received June 14, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1394. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Safety Standard for High Chairs [Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0031] received May 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules; Regional Haze [EPA-R08-OAR-2021-0002; FRL-10024-54-Region 8] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cellulose, ethyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0138; FRL-10023-34] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Second Maintenance

Plan for the Tioga County Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0321; FRL-10023-81-Region 3] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard and Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry for the 2008 and 2015 Ozone Standards; Correction [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0327; FRL-10024-76-Region 1] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1399. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-7.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0303; FRL-10021-85] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1400. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-6.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0251; FRL-10021-77] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1401. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (20-5.B) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0222; FRL-10018-77] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1402. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revised Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2020-0272; FRL-10024-45-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU84) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1403. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances (20-2.M) [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2020-0302; FRL-10022-76] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1404. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0626; EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0082; and EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0345; FRL-10022-28] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1405. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; Eastern Kern Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reclassification to Severe [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0340; FRL-10024-58-Region 9] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1406. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Florida; Maintenance Plan Update for the Hillsborough County Lead Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0185; FRL-10024-49 Region 4] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1407. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Two Revised Sulfur Dioxide Rules for Lake County [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0369; FRL-10024-65-Region 5] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1408. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Sponsorship Identification Requirements for Foreign Government-Provided Programming [MB Docket No.: 20-299] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1409. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economic and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Certification adopted for auction of flexible-use service licenses in the 3.45-3.55 GHz band for next-generation wireless services (Auction 10) [AU Docket No.: 21-62] received June 8, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1410. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Allocation of Spectrum for Non-Federal Space Launch Operations; Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules for Federal Earth Stations Communicating with Non-Federal Fixed Satellite Service Space Stations; and Federal Space Station Use of the 399.9-400.05 MHz Band [ET Docket No.: 13-115] (RM-11341) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1411. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Policy Division, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Improving Public Safety Communications in the 800MHz Band [WT Docket: 02-55] (Proceeding Terminated) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1412. A letter from the Managing Director, Office of the Managing Director, Financial Operations, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2021; Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2020 [MD Docket No.: 21-190] [MD Docket No.: 20-105] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1413. A letter from the Executive Director, Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, transmitting the Council's interim final rule — Privacy Act

Regulations (RIN: 3219-AA03) received June 11, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1414. A letter from the Biologist, Special Assistant, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Designating Critical Habitat for the Central America, Mexico, and Western North Pacific Distinct Population Segments of Humpback Whales [Docket No.: 210415-0080] (RIN: 0648-BI06) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1415. A letter from the Agency Representative, United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to Representation of Others before the United States Patent and Trademark Office [Docket No.: PTO-C-2013-0042] (RIN: 0651-AC91) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1416. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of Aviation Consumer Protection, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tarmac Delay Rule [Docket No.: DOT-OST-2019-0144] (RIN: 2105-AE47) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1417. A letter from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Extension of Veterans' Group Life Insurance (VGLI) Application Periods in Response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (RIN: 2900-AR24) received June 14, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1418. A letter from the Chief, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe harbor for taxpayers who relied on IRC Notice 2020-32 and/or Revenue Ruling 2020-27 [Revenue Procedure 2021-20] received May 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-1419. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Modification of Limitations on Redesignation by the Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board (MGCRB) [CMS-1762-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AU56) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-1420. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Center for Clinical Standards and Quality, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Medicare Coverage of Innovative Technology (MCIT) and Definition of "Reasonable and Necessary"; Delay in Effective Date [CMS-3372-F2] (RIN: 0938-AT88) received June 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

EC-1421. A letter from the Section Chief, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement

Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Remimazolam in Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-658] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

EC-1422. A letter from the Section Chief, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lemborexant in Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-600] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

EC-1423. A letter from the Deputy Director and Acting Director of Privacy and Open Government, Office of the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017 Implementation [Docket No.: 210329-0073] (RIN: 0605-AA49) received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Reform and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2062. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriated standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Joint Resolution 34. Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review" (Rept. 117-64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. WATERS: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1443. A bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to require the collection of small business loan data related to LGBTQ-owned businesses; with an amendment (Rept. 117-65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York: Committee on Oversight and Reform. H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-66, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2662 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia (for herself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3960. A bill to eliminate the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, remove firearm restrictions on lawful gun owners, and provide funds to surviving families of border patrol agents killed as a result of Operation Fast and Furious; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Ms. BUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for a demonstration project under the Medicaid program for political subdivisions of States to provide medical assistance for the expansion population under such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BUDD, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. WEXTON, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 3962. A bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3963. A bill to expand compassionate release authority and elderly home confinement access for offenders with heightened coronavirus risk; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GIMENEZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. MAST, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. STEEL, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS):

H.R. 3964. A bill to require the United States Trade Representative to submit a report on the manner and extent to which Nicaragua is in compliance with the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 3965. A bill to designate Ansarallah as a foreign terrorist organization and impose certain sanctions on Ansarallah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLYDE (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3966. A bill to prohibit the United States from rejoining the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) until the President makes certain certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MENG, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 3967. A bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TORRES of New York (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 3968. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the National Credit Union Administration, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the United States Department of

the Treasury to update guidance on customer identification regulations with respect to the use of identification cards issued by a municipality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to include activities to address social determinants of health in the calculation of medical loss ratios; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 3970. A bill to require Federal agencies to timely respond to right-of-way requests for the build out of broadband service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. HERN, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. BACON, Mr. CASE, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 3972. A bill to support the diplomatic, economic, and physical space of Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide for improved precision in the listing, delisting, and downlisting of endangered species and potentially endangered species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KIND, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CHU, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3974. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 3975. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to modify and extend the Generalized System of Preferences, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina):

H.R. 3976. A bill to provide defense and security assistance to ensure the survival of Israel and its people from an existing or imminent military threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3977. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to limit assistance to the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3978. A bill to make it unlawful to send a demand letter in bad faith for a patent relating to COVID-19 related products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3979. A bill to establish a refund effective date for rates and charges under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3980. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study on facial recognition technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 3981. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing, and distribution of traditional and premium cigars; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. HERRELL, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 3983. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue regulations with respect to the optional practical training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 3984. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide a civil action against a foreign state for deliberate concealment or distortion of information with respect to an international public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BACON, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. BERA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LAMB, Ms. DEAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 3986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the work opportunity tax credit with respect to workforce development and foster care transition youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3987. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BASS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3988. A bill to enhance mental health and psychosocial support within United States foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend the consumer product safety laws to repeal of exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product under such laws; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3990. A bill to ban the use of intentionally added perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances in cosmetics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. CAWTHORN):

H.R. 3991. A bill to require that any person that maintains an internet website or that sells or distributes a mobile application that maintains and stores information collected from such website or application in China to disclose that such information is stored and maintained in the People's Republic of China and whether the Chinese Communist Party or a Chinese state-owned entity has access to such information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3992. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 prohibit employers from limiting, segregating, or classifying applicants for employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TLAIb, Ms. MENG, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SIREs, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 3993. A bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating

the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. STEIL):

H.R. 3994. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization period for emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities under the Veterans Community Care Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 3995. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress a report on the global nuclear leadership of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BACON, Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 3996. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mr. BACON, and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to enhance direct certification under the school lunch program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 3998. A bill to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to make video recordings of the examination and testing of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3999. A bill to appropriately limit the size of the population required for urban areas of metropolitan statistical areas; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4000. A bill to require any person that maintains an internet website or that sells or distributes a mobile application that is owned, wholly or partially, by the Chinese Communist Party or by a non-state owned entity located in the People's Republic of China, to disclose that fact to any individual who downloads or otherwise uses such application; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4001. A bill to require online retailers to prominently disclose product country-of-

origin information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 4002. A bill to expand access to graduate education by amending the Federal Pell Grant program to include postbaccalaureate study; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. HERN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4003. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate work disincentives for childhood disability beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 4004. A bill to prohibit Federal funding for institutions of higher education that have partnerships with schools or other organizations funded by North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 4005. A bill to direct the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish a School Cybersecurity Improvement Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 4006. A bill to require original equipment manufacturers of digital electronic equipment to make available certain documentation, diagnostic, and repair information to independent repair providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TIFANY, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUDD, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. MANN, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 4007. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure that public institutions of higher education eschew policies that improperly constrain the expressive rights of students, and to ensure that private institutions of higher education are transparent about, and responsible for, their chosen speech policies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a virtual health pilot program to facilitate utilization of remote patient monitoring technology to maintain or expand access to health care services for individuals in

rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4009. A bill to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include fuel cells using electromechanical processes for purposes of the energy tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. GARCIA of Illinois):

H.R. 4011. A bill to divert Federal funding away from supporting the presence of police in schools and toward evidence-based and trauma informed services that address the needs of marginalized students and improve academic outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permanently include certain HCPCS codes as telehealth services under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. CLOUD, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4013. A bill to end the emergency increase in unemployment compensation benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4014. A bill to provide for a new building period with respect to the cap on full-time equivalent residents for purposes of payment for graduate medical education costs under the Medicare program for certain hospitals that have established a shortage specialty program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. MELJER, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 4015. A bill to amend subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act to support workers as they re-enter the labor force by providing a newly employed worker allowance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the use of certain electric highway vehicles to fund the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4017. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2021 through 2023 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUNES, and Mrs. STEEL):

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide drought relief in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to adjust the penalty for unjust conviction and imprisonment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BOWMAN, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 4020. A bill to reform United States drug policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Oversight and Reform, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, House Administration, Armed Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 4021. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the Exceptional Family Member Program Advisory Council of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.J. Res. 53. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H. Res. 483. A resolution recognizing the 125th Anniversary of the Indiana Veterans' Home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr.

NORMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. MACE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. EMMER, and Ms. CHENEY):

H. Res. 484. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should not waive intellectual property rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines or treatments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 3960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 3963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 3964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 3965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYDE:

H.R. 3966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I; Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 3968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8;

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 3971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 3972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Powers of the Congress

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 3973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause II. "The Congress shall have power to declar War"
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14. "The Congress shall have power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval Forces."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 3977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section I, which includes an implied power for the Congress to regulate the conduct of the United States with respect to foreign affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 3978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority granted to Congress to regulate patent and intellectual property law is derived from Article I, Section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution, providing the legislature with the power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." Further, the Necessary and Proper Clause found in Article I, Section 8, clause 18, provides Congress with the power to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 3979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 3983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 3984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

"Provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States"

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers."

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 3985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 3990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 gives Congress the specific power to regulate commerce with other nations. This bill seeks to regulate one small portion of commerce, namely protecting the data of American citizens from companies who might store that data in China or allow the government of the Chinese Communist Party to have access to that data.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 3993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 3994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 3995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 7

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 3997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 3998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States . . ."

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 3999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8; Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I; Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 4003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 4004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 4006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 4007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 4008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 4010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 4012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 4013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 4015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers; and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying out into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, Section 9, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 53.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 18: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 263: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 426: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 503: Ms. BASS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 605: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 653: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 735: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 761: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 818: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 825: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 852: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 884: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 890: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HERN, and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 933: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 1011: Mr. LATURNER, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 1012: Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1016: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1117: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1131: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1145: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1182: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1183: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1240: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1283: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1297: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 1368: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1394: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1456: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1474: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1577: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. COLE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1581: Ms. BUSH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LAMB, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1582: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 1596: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1630: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1661: Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KATKO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1749: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1800: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1815: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1829: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1915: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1957: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1977: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 2011: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2012: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2062: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 2094: Mr. TRONE and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 2108: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2119: Ms. ROSS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2126: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2144: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 2154: Ms. MANNING and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2184: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2238: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2249: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 2255: Mr. WELCH and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2258: Mrs. MCCLAINE.

H.R. 2269: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 2307: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2325: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RESCIENTHALER.

H.R. 2328: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. Velázquez.

H.R. 2362: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 2372: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2374: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. BACON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MANN, Mr. COLE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2385: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2399: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 2447: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. HAGEDORN.
 H.R. 2467: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 2486: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. CARSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 2503: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2517: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. BOST, and Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 2549: Mr. BROWN.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KUSTOFF, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CASE, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2585: Ms. CHENEY.
 H.R. 2586: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2648: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LETLOW, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2724: Mr. BOWMAN.
 H.R. 2734: Ms. WILD and Mr. SWALWELL.
 H.R. 2748: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. STEIL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 2759: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
 H.R. 2774: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2840: Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 2859: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 2900: Mr. CARSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. CASE and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. EVANS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 2931: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2974: Ms. STRICKLAND and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2991: Mr. JONES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3044: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 3046: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3054: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3076: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BACON, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 3104: Ms. LETLOW and Mr. TIFFANY.
 H.R. 3109: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 3165: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3222: Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3246: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3247: Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 3256: Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 3294: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3335: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3341: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SIREs, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MACE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3369: Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 3377: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
 H.R. 3408: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 3435: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
 H.R. 3440: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3443: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 3446: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3488: Ms. WILD and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 3491: Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 3515: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 3537: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MANN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 3554: Mr. COMER.
 H.R. 3622: Ms. STRICKLAND and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3630: Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MACE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CRIST, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 3648: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 3703: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3732: Mr. KAHELE.
 H.R. 3778: Mr. POCAN and Ms. JACOBS of California.
 H.R. 3780: Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 3790: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3791: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 3800: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3807: Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. FALLONE, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 3811: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 3820: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
 H.R. 3823: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3829: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3834: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 3843: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 3867: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3875: Mrs. KIM of California.
 H.R. 3901: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 3926: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 3959: Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 29: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mrs. LESKO.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. TRAHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H. Res. 47: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 117: Mr. ALLRED.
 H. Res. 118: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 121: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. BROWN.
 H. Res. 225: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H. Res. 413: Mr. RASKIN.
 H. Res. 469: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H. Res. 471: Ms. STEFANIK.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Mr. Crenshaw.

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mr. Rouzer, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mr. Guthrie.